Ngā Whare Rau o Te Tahinga:

Rakaipaakatanga and Post-Settlement Futures

By Hollie Francesca Russell

A thesis submitted to Victoria University of Wellington in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in Cultural Anthropology

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
March 2015

‘Ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga’
‘The many houses of Te Tahinga’

Ko Moumoukai te maunga
Ko Waitirohia me Ngā Nuhaka ngā awa
Ko Tākitimu te waka
Ko Ngāti Rakaipaaka te iwi
Ko Tāne-nui-a-Rangi te marae
Ko Tāne-nui-a-Rangi te wharenuī
Ko Mateparae te wharekai
Ko Te Mimi o Te Hiki te urupā
Ko Te Aranga te whare karakia
Ko Iraia Te Hanene rāua ko Rawinia Torere ōku tīpuna
Ko Hira Patio Raroa tōku Koro
Ko Kiriwera Pani tōku Kuia
Ko Jackie Pani tōku Māmā
Ko Robert Russell tōku Pāpā, ā ko Ngāti Kōtirangi tōna iwi
Nō reira, ko au ko ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga
Ko Hollie Russell ahau

Tuhinga Whakarāpopoto – Abstract

This thesis explores what it means to be Ngāti Rakaipaaka today and how this ‘being’ may influence post-settlement futures for the iwi and its members. This thesis is a celebration of contemporary, dynamic, diverse and flourishing Rakaipaaka Māori. The understandings that are presented are the result of an extended stay in Nuhaka (part of Rakaipaaka’s rohe or tribal territory), nine interviews with ten contributors and countless informal conversations, including online, with members of Rakaipaaka. With these understandings as well as a discussion of the skills, assets and aspirations of the Rakaipaaka community this thesis explores how understandings of being Rakaipaaka may be incorporated into post-settlement futures. It argues that there is importance in diversity as well as unity, and asserts that for post-settlement development models to be successful they must reflect the diverse range of Rakaipaakatanga – Rakaipaaka identity. At the same time, the models need to be practical, responding to the challenges and problems Rakaipaaka face today and may face in the future. In essence, they must uplift and develop Rakaipaaka people in positive, sustainable, and Māori ways.

He Mihi – Acknowledgements

Ehara taku toa, i te toa takitahi, engari, he toa takitini
Mine is not my strength alone, it is the strength of many

First and foremost, I am grateful for the ten contributors who gave me their time and thoughts which have given life to this thesis – each of their journeys is important. I am also grateful for my Nuhaka whānau, especially my Aunty Poipoi and Uncle Bub, and my cousin Avon and her husband Russell who housed, fed, and gave me unending support during my fieldwork; my supervisors, Jeff and Maria who have dealt with late drafts and missing references all whilst encouraging me to find my own academic voice; my friends who have been amazing flatmates, editors, translators, sounding boards and beer-drinking companions; and finally my family, whom without I would not have had the strength, confidence or humour needed to deal with writing a thesis. Thank you.

This thesis is dedicated to my babies – Jaquey Te Wairua, Izakche, Brody, Harlem-Cruz, Ivy-Rose, Iraia Te Hanene, Liam and Ocean-Jade – whose beautiful hearts and faces have been a constant source of inspiration and motivation.

Rārangi Kōrero – Table of Contents

8	He Tīmatanga – Beginnings and Introductions
9	Community Profile
10	Questions and Aims
11	Chapter Outline
13	Doing the Research – Kaupapa Māori
14	Tino Rangatiratanga
15	Whanaungatanga
16	Manaakitanga
17	Research Techniques
17	Interviews
20	Participant Observation
20	Online
22	A Theoretical Framework – The Koru
23	Anthropological Understandings of Māori Social Organisation
26	Becoming
27	Kaupapa Māori
30	Rakaipaakatanga
32	Whenua
33	Dwelling
34	Mana Whenua, Tūrangawaewae, and ‘Imports’
36	Urbanisation
37	Iwi ahi kā and Iwi taura here
38	Whakapapa
38	Whakapapa as a ‘Meshwork’
40	Whanaungatanga
43	Belonging and Rakaipaakatanga
43	Te reo Māori
44	Language, Identity, and Education
46	Code-mixing
47	Using te reo Pākehā to assert Māoritanga
48	Whakataukī
50	Conclusion
51	Post-Settlement Futures
52	Māori Models
52	Sustainable Models
53	Practical Models

54	Making and Binding Connections
58	Conclusion
59	He Whakamutunga - Conclusion
63	Rārangi Pukapuka – Bibliography
75	Appendix A – Map
76	Appendix B – Glossary

He Tīmatanga – Beginnings and Introductions

There were two people who inspired me to look to my iwi as the kaupapa¹ for my thesis. The first was my good friend Tarapuhi, who told me that as a politically and socially aware Māori academic I had certain privileges. She explained that such privileges meant I had a responsibility to do research that was about Māori, with Māori, and uplifted Māori in a world that often does not. Tarapuhi was right, and although it was a responsibility I did not see it as a burden. Rather I am humbled that I have an opportunity to take part in projects that benefit my whānau², not to mention the added bonus of spending time with them. The second person was my Auntie Poipoi, who whilst chatting with me about my Masters, suggested I look at our iwi, Ngāti Rakaipaaka. Passionate about the great things Rakaipaaka has to offer and the young people that bring new life to it, she thought more could be written about the iwi today. It was the combination of these two suggestions that led me to the topic of this thesis - what it means to be Ngāti Rakaipaaka³ today and how this 'being' may influence post-settlement futures for the iwi and its members. This thesis is a celebration of contemporary, dynamic, diverse and flourishing Rakaipaaka people.

My position in this research is as a participant and observer, and the understandings I present are the result of an extended stay with my whānau in Nuhaka (part of Rakaipaaka's rohe⁴), nine interviews with eleven contributors and countless informal conversations, including online, with members of Rakaipaaka. Here, I argue that understandings of Rakaipaakatanga need to be inclusive of those whose experiences do not align with expectations, which in turn will produce a more diverse picture of Rakaipaaka, one which better represents the iwi's contemporary circumstances and makeup. With these understandings, as well as an outline of ngā taonga anamata⁵ and the aspirations of the Rakaipaaka community, this thesis will explore how understandings of being Rakaipaaka may be incorporated into post-settlement models which focus on cultural development. I argue that there is importance in diversity as well as unity, and assert that for post-settlement cultural development models to be successful they must reflect diverse understandings of Rakaipaakatanga⁶. At the same time, they need to be practical, responding to the challenges and problems the Rakaipaaka community face today and may face in the future. In essence, they must uplift and develop Rakaipaaka in positive, sustainable, and Māori ways.

The title of this thesis, Ngā Whare Rau o Te Tahinga, translates to 'the hundred houses of Te Tahinga' and is a whakataukī⁷ often used by Rakaipaaka people. It speaks of the Rakaipaaka ancestor, Te Tahinga, son of Pokia Te Rangi and grandson of Rakaipaaka. As a chief of the Rakaipaaka tribe, Te Tahinga gave equal status to each of his sons. As Hana Whaanga, one of my contributors, explained to me, "this gave each whānau or family who have roots in Rakaipaaka – in Nuhaka – the right to be heard, to voice

---

¹ Topic.

² Blood kin, extended family.

³ Will now be referred to as Rakaipaaka reflecting its usage during my fieldwork.

⁴ Tribal territory.

⁵ Valuable things for the future – the term will be discussed in more depth in Chapter 5: Post-Settlement Futures.

⁶ Rakaipaaka Identity, the suffix '-tanga' is added to nouns to indicate a quality derived from the base noun.

⁷ Proverb, saying.

their opinions, to be respected as a rangatira⁸. Another of my contributors, Liz Hunkin, spoke about her understanding of the whakataukī in her interview with me:

To me, Te Tahinga was a very astute rangatira. What he did . . . before he made his decision, was ask different [people for] their opinions before he made his. For me, that was the sign of a real rangatira, getting the feel of the people, what they want and then acting on it, knowing full well that he'd have their full support. . . You know we've got a lot of strong people, strong-minded I suppose, but we all know that we can't move on our own. There's no way you can go by yourself and I think this is the lesson that Te Tahinga has left for us - 'if you move as one, my gosh how much stronger you're gonna be'. And for me that's the lesson [this] whakataukī gives, that if we work together, if we've got the support of all the people, nothing can stand in our way.

This conversation with Liz not only shaped the way I understood the whakataukī, but also influenced the way I have written this thesis. It inspired me to respect the diversity of Rakaipaaka people whilst also underlining the iwi's strength as a collective. It motivated me to be broad in my search for contributors, to listen to and respect those who wished to speak, and to allow them to affect the shape of this thesis.

Although the whakataukī is an accurate reflection of my thesis topic and aims, the decision to make it my title was not entirely my own. After explaining her understanding of the whakataukī, Liz, in a classic nanny move, politely but bluntly proposed, as only nannies can, "I think that should be the name of your what's-its-name, 'Ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga'".

Community Profile

Rakaipaaka is a sub-tribe of Ngāti Kahungunu based in the Nuhaka region of the Wairoa District. The Rakaipaaka rohe is from the Opoho Stream and Te Kaha o Turei in the west, northward adjoining Hereheretau, then north to the Maraetaha blocks. From there the boundary follows an easterly direction to the Paritu block, then a southerly direction bounding the Kopuawhara lands to the coast to Waikokopu, finally running along the coast to Te Ngutu Awa o Nuhaka (The Ngāti Rakaipaaka Story 2014, 4) (see *Appendix A* for map). Rakaipaaka are descendants of the Takitimu Waka which was captained by the ancestor, Tamatea Ariki Nui. Below is a basic genealogical history:

Tamatea Ariki Nui	=	Toto
Rongokakao	=	Muriwhenua
Tamatea Pokai Whenua	=	Iwipupu
Kahungunu	=	Rongomaiwahine o Nukutaurua
Kahukuranui	=	Tuteihonga
Rakaipaaka	=	Turumakina

(I.e. from Tamatea Ariki and Toto came Rongokakao) (Raroa N.D)

Today, Rakaipaaka's name is commemorated in the tribal name of those that have descended from him. The 2013 census records that 1,317 people affiliate to Rakaipaaka with 19 percent identifying Rakaipaaka as their sole iwi affiliation. Over half live in main urban areas, only slightly less than the

---

⁸ Chief, Leader.

general Māori population, with the most common regions of residence being Hawke's Bay, Auckland and Wellington. Rakaipaaka is an aging population with 30 percent under the age of 15, compared with 33 percent of the total population of Māori descent, and a decrease of 2 percent in this age bracket since 2006. 18.7 percent were aged 15-29, 41.7 percent were aged 30-64 years old, and 9.8 percent were over 65. The median age was 31.3 percent compared with 24.4 years for the general Māori population. The descendants of Rakaipaaka have reasonable te reo Māori statistics. Almost 34 percent can hold a conversation about everyday things in te reo Māori, in comparison with 18.4 percent of the total population of Māori descent. However, this is down from 2006 when the figure was 35.8 percent. Almost 72 percent of Rakaipaaka descendants hold a formal qualification, only slightly higher than the total population of Māori descent. 17.3 percent held a Bachelor's degree or higher, an increase from 11.8 since 2006. The median income for members is \$24,400, an increase of \$1,700 since 2006, however 44.2 percent reported an annual personal income of \$20,000 or less (Statistics NZ 2013).

Rakaipaaka are currently in the midst of Treaty settlement negotiations which they began actively participating in 1980s, beginning with the submission of two claims to the Waitangi Tribunal as *Te Rūnanga o Rakaipaaka* – WAI 300 for the Wharerata Forest and WAI 301 for the Morere Hot Springs (The Ngāti Rakaipaaka Story 2014, 12). As the negotiations progressed, the Rakaipaaka negotiating team recognised the need to develop a structure that would gain Legal Entity recognition, and in 1996 *Te Iwi o Rakaipaaka Incorporated* was established. Following this, a Crown policy forced Rakaipaaka to progress the claims as part of a Large Natural Grouping (LNG) which meant a delay in negotiations. This LNG, who for the duration of the Treaty settlement negotiations goes under the name *Te Tira Whakaemi o Te Wairoa*, comprises of six other "cluster groups" of the Wairoa district including Ngāti Rongomaiwahine, Whakakī-nui-a-Rua, Tapokorau 1, Tapokorau 2, Wairoa Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board and Ngāti Hinemanuhiri (The Ngāti Rakaipaaka Story 2014, 3). Negotiators representing Te Tira Whakaemi o Te Wairoa, which represents around 30,400 people descended from Kahungunu and the Takitimu waka (Statistics NZ 2013), signed an Agreement in Principle on the 11th of June 2014, and hope to sign a Deed of Settlement by mid-2015 (Tāmami Olsen, Interview 2014). The total value of the settlement is currently set at \$100 million and includes "redress of Wharerata and Patunamu Forests, a number of Department of Conservation sites and a social and economic revitalisation strategy in partnership with government agencies" (Finlayson 2014). Representatives of Rakaipaaka stress that the motivation for continuing with the Treaty settlement process comes from memories of Rakaipaaka "koroua, kuia, pākeke, [and] kaumātua who fought hard for justice from the Crown for the breaches of the Treaty [and who] grieved for many years for their descendants not to settle until justice has been recognised, accepted, redressed, compensated and apologised to, on their behalf" (The Ngāti Rakaipaaka Story 2014, 12).

Questions and Aims

This thesis looks to answer questions that fall into three themes:

1. What does it mean to be Rakaipaaka?
  - What elements are the foundations of Rakaipaakatanga? How are these foundations expressed and articulated as being part of Rakaipaakatanga? How do these foundations shape community aspirations?
2. What are some new ways of understanding the foundations of Rakaipaakatanga that could help towards resolving tension caused by experiences that do not align with expectations?
3. What does the post-settlement future look like for Rakaipaaka?

- What are some of the questions and issues raised when considering the place of Rakaipaakatanga in post-settlement futures? How can Rakaipaakatanga be used, and incorporated into post-settlement models which focus on cultural development?

As well as answering these questions, this thesis also has three over-arching aims:

1. To uplift the voices of my participants as holders of valuable knowledge regarding Rakaipaakatanga and broader iwi identity
2. To recognise and celebrate diversity, though not at the expense of unity
3. And to privilege Māori worldviews which naturalise and prioritise the aspirations of Māori.

Chapter Outline

This first chapter, as well as providing an introduction to the Rakaipaaka community, has outlined the questions my thesis looks to answer and aims it looks to fulfil.

Chapter Two discusses ‘doing’ the research. My methodology was formed in response to a history of unethical and harmful research done *on* Māori and its damaging effects (Smith 1999). The methodology is based on Kaupapa Māori principles which privilege Māori ways of knowing, being and doing, assuming the validity of a Māori worldview. It also aligns with my aim to recognise the diversity of Māori identity and experience. I focus on three Māori principles – Tino Rangatiratanga, Whanaungatanga and Manaakitanga, which shaped the way my research was conducted. My methods focus on three research techniques I used to gather data – participant observation, interviews, and online data collection.

Chapter Three situates my thesis in Māori, and more broadly Indigenous, identity literature. In doing so, it explains the choice of my theoretical framework – a koru. Consistent with my aims, I wanted a framework that gave genuine recognition to both the diversity *and* uniformity inherent in collective identity whilst also privileging a Māori worldview. This led me to the koru, which is a collaboration of sorts between Kaupapa Māori and the idea of Becoming, both of which I will explain here.

Chapter Four explores the foundations of Rakaipaakatanga – whenua, whakapapa, and te reo Māori. It discusses how the foundations are expressed and articulated by the Rakaipaaka community as being important elements of Rakaipaakatanga, using the koru framework to highlight important ways of understanding these foundations. This chapter also highlights tensions that arise when people’s experience do not align with expectation in regards to these foundations. It then uses the koru framework to propose different ways of considering the foundations that may help to solve these tensions.

Chapter Five explores the challenges Rakaipaaka face in post-settlement futures, using the expressed desire for Rakaipaaka people to be comfortable and confident in our cultural identities to ground the discussion. It raises questions regarding how this aspiration might be achieved, and considers the benefits and limits of ngā taonga anamata that may be harnessed to help. The term ‘futures’ has an important association with Māori literature which must be acknowledged here. In particular, a series of publications released by Te Puni Kōkiri in 2007, which looked to create an “informed understanding of the possible future drivers of influence affecting how Māori participate in both the future New Zealand and global economic systems” (9). More information regarding these publications can be found in the bibliography under Te Puni Kōkiri. My use of the term ‘futures’ is not connected to Te Puni Kōkiri’s

publications, rather I saw it a fitting term for asserting the idea that there are, and will continue to be, many ways of being Rakaipaaka.

Doing the Research – Kaupapa Māori

A history of unethical and harmful research done *on* Māori and its damaging effects (Smith 1999) has made me determined to be a part of a project which promotes Tino Rangatiratanga⁹, amplifying the voices and desires of my contributors rather than silencing them. How to do this has been a question I have asked throughout the year. Particularly, what methods are appropriate for the type of research I am doing and the research community I am working with? There have been many Māori and non-Māori anthropologists who have carried out ethically sound and highly valuable research with Māori communities, and who have had a positive influence on the nature of Aotearoa New Zealand research (Henare 2006). However, Anthropology as a discipline has been very much implicated in harmful research, causing many Māori as well as other Indigenous people to be wary of anthropologists (Smith 1999, 1). This history has remained with me throughout the research process. It has been the critical nature of Kaupapa Māori that has helped me to navigate my position as a Māori Anthropology student, and thus it is the foundation upon which I have chosen to build my methodology.

Kaupapa Māori research is based on a Māori worldview acknowledging the idea that “knowledge is rooted in cultural contexts” (Vakalahi and Taiapa 2013, 401). It privileges Māori ways of doing and knowing, rejecting outside controls over what constitutes authority and truth (Smith 1999). Arising in response to Western-centric education theories that presented Māori as deficient and problematic (Smith et al 2012, 10-11), Kaupapa Māori theory offers a “counter-hegemonic approach to western forms of research” (Smith 2000, 17). It has roots in critical theory and in a similar vein combines “transformative practice with structural analysis” (Smith et al 2012, 11), challenging mainstream theories and institutions that oppress Māori. Helen Moewaka Barnes explains that the establishment of Kaupapa Māori methodologies was similar – “in part, grown out of dissatisfaction with prevailing methodologies . . . [with which] issues of concern to Māori [were] not seen to be adequately addressed by non-Māori researchers” (Barnes 2000, 2). Both Kaupapa Māori theory and methodology “challenge, question, and critique Pākehā¹⁰ hegemony” in research (Pihama et al 2002, 33).

Kaupapa Māori challenges dominant research paradigms because it assumes the centrality and validity of a Māori worldview, suggesting that dominant Western paradigms, which are often made to seem natural, are in fact constructs based on a specific worldview (Barnes 2000, 2). In response, it provides a space where Māori aspirations and wellbeing are normalised and prioritised, questioning “the right of Pākehā to dominate and exclude Māori preferred interests” in Aotearoa New Zealand (Smith 1997, 273). Leonie Pihama and colleagues argue that as a framework for research Kaupapa Māori “asserts the position that to be Māori is both valid and legitimate”, in other words, “to be Māori is taken for granted” (Pihama et al 2002, 36). Te reo Māori me ōna tikanga¹¹ are brought to the centre and the right of Māori to flourish as tangata whenua¹² is maintained (Smith 1997, 273). In a recent interview, leading Kaupapa Māori theorist Graham Hingangaroa Smith argued that “the best examples of Kaupapa Māori practice lead to transforming outcomes that allow Māori still to be Māori, and also enable successful participation in all aspects of New Zealand life” (2012, 16). Pihama and colleagues likewise propose that “the essence of . . . Kaupapa Māori initiatives is the desire of Māori to be Māori”, to affirm

---

⁹ Self-determination.

¹⁰ New Zealander of European descent, also used as an adjective in place of European or Western.

¹¹ Māori language and customs.

¹² Indigenous people.

and legitimise Māoritanga¹³ (Pihama et al 2002, 30). They later add that Kaupapa Māori education also provides students the “tools to survive in a Pākehā-dominated society” (Pihama et al 2002, 41).

Using Kaupapa Māori as a framework for doing my research has also aligned with my aims to appreciate complexity *and* commonality. It recognises the diversity of Māori values, experiences, and ways of seeing the world. Pihama and colleagues outline that:

Kaupapa Māori is for all Māori, not for select groups or individuals. Kaupapa Māori is not owned by any group, nor can it be defined in ways that deny Māori people access to its articulation. This means that Kaupapa Māori must of necessity be diverse and recognize the diversity within our people; women, men, *tamariki* (children), *kuia* (female elder), *koroua* (male elder), *rangatahi* (young person), *whānau*, *hapū*, *iwi*, urban Māori: these are some of the examples of the diversity within our people and therefore Kaupapa Māori needs to be accessible and available to all (Pihama et al 2002, 39).

This also serves to remind me that Kaupapa Māori does not have a definitive checklist but rather the form it takes is dependent on the research, researcher and research community. I learnt this at a session held by MAI ki Poneke¹⁴ on Kaupapa Māori Theory and Research in April 2014. At the session, Hiria McRae facilitated my own comprehension of what Kaupapa Māori means, what it could mean to my participants, and what it means for my project. Linda Tuhiwai Smith similarly suggests that Kaupapa Māori research should reflect the “diversity of our experiences and backgrounds” as Māori (2000, 18), although not at the expense of the researcher’s Māori identity. The assertion made by Kathie Irwin that Kaupapa Māori research is done by Māori academics, not academics that happen to be Māori (1994, 27), was an affirmation that stayed with me throughout my research. It acted as a reminder of my commitment to provide research for the betterment of my people, not because I have kin relationships that allow me to exploit certain knowledge. In line with the idea that the shape of Kaupapa Māori depends on the research community, researcher and research, I have chosen here to focus on three Māori concepts that shaped how I conducted my research – Tino Rangatiratanga, Whanaungatanga, and Manaakitanga. These three concepts embody important parts of Kaupapa Māori which will be made clear throughout this section.

Tino Rangatiratanga

Ngahuia Te Awekotuku has said that “a researcher’s responsibility, when working with people, is to the people themselves” (Te Awekotuku 1991, 16). Those doing research with Māori have to protect them from re-colonisation through research, and placing Tino Rangatiratanga at the centre is a step towards achieving this. Pihama and colleagues explain that Tino Rangatiratanga has been translated to mean “sovereignty, autonomy, and *mana motuhake*, self-determination and independence” but in its essence it reinforces “the goal of seeking more meaningful control over one’s life and cultural wellbeing” (2002, 34). Russell Bishop suggests that “the call for self-determination is often misunderstood by non-Māori people. It is not a call for separatism, nor is it a call for non-Māori people to stand back and leave Māori alone. It is a call for Māori and non-Māori alike, to reposition themselves in relation to the aspirations of Māori people for an autonomous voice” (1996, 18). Kaupapa Māori can be seen as “the deconstruction of the hegemonies which have disempowered Māori from controlling and defining their own knowledge within the context of unequal power relations in New Zealand” (Bishop 1996, 13). It is

---

¹³ Māori identity.

¹⁴ A group for Māori and Indigenous students of Wellington.

research done with (not on) Māori, by Māori, for Māori, asserting and reinforcing the goal of allowing Māori to control Māori culture, aspirations and destiny. Shawn Wilson argues that the development of Indigenous research paradigms, which includes Kaupapa Māori, promote self-determination. He gives the example of Indigenous psychology suggesting that “Indigenous people will be the ones who decide what is “normal” or “abnormal”, or if that distinction even needs to exist” (2008, 19).

Placing importance on the presence of Tino Rangatiratanga in research means that methods that are inherent and unique to Māori should be used, as well as non-Māori practices that are preferred by Māori, and allow for the uninhibited expression of Māori self-determination (Barnes 2000, 5). Helen Moewaka Barnes suggests that qualitative methods tend to be appropriate in research with Māori, because they have a tendency to enable equality in conversation. Furthermore, she suggests that with qualitative methods “power can be negotiated in ways that are not generally considered or thought possible in more quantitative approaches” (Barnes 2000, 6). For example, the semi-structured interviews I used gave my contributors the opportunity to steer and focus the discussion according to their own desires. Many took advantage of this, interpreting open-ended questions as they saw fit in some cases, and avoiding the question sheet entirely in others, actions which both offered valuable information. For example, Hana Whaanga prepared some information about education in Nuhaka for me before her interview and spoke to what she had written rather than focus on my prepared questions. In another instance Liz Hunkin chose to focus on three themes in her interview – connections, the future, and whakataukī, using her interview to tell me stories that expressed these themes.

Such flexibility, and willingness to give my contributors power over the interview did not only work in their favour but also provided me with rich and diverse answers, exemplifying the variety of Rakaipaaka experience and understandings. Encouraging story-telling in interviews was an important part of prompting this diversity, and at the same time, prioritised the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga. As Russell Bishop suggests, the use of stories “addresses Māori concerns about research into their lives in a holistic, culturally appropriate manner because story telling allows the research participants to select, recollect and reflect on stories within their own cultural context and language rather than in the cultural context and language chosen by the researcher. In this sense, stories are able to address the potential for hegemony by the researcher” (1996, 24). He goes on to explain that “storytelling . . . determines that the storyteller maintains the power to define what constitutes the story and the truth and meaning it has for them” (1996, 25). In this way, story-telling ensures that the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga is upheld in the interview process. It does this by ensuring the power of the conversation, and therefore the data collected, rests with the story-teller, rather than solely with the researcher.

Whanaungatanga

Prioritising Tino Rangatiratanga was also an acknowledgment of my responsibilities and obligations as a researcher to care for the relationships that have been instrumental to my research, which is where the concept of whanaungatanga comes in. Whanaungatanga lies at the centre of Kaupapa Māori research and this project. It acknowledges the relationships that Māori have to one another and to the world around them and the importance of these relationships. It is a concept that describes kinship relations, a sense of family connection and belonging, and the establishing and maintaining of these relationships. It is a “network which links Māori to their whānau, hapū, iwi and te ao Māori” (Ka’ai and Higgins 2004, 18). Significantly, whanaungatanga permeates what it means to be Māori, acting as a “cultural framework for Māori identity” (Ka’ai and Higgins 2004, 18). In research, whanaungatanga can be likened to relationality which is the idea that “relationships do not merely shape reality, relationships are reality”

(Wilson 2008). Aileen Moreton-Robinson and Maggie Walter support this arguing that “connectivity is integral to knowledge production” in Indigenous research, and “knowledge cannot exist outside social relations” (2010, 4).

Whanaungatanga was a prominent element in connecting and re-connecting with my extended whānau and potential research contributors. Early on I attended the signing of the Agreement in Principle for Rakaipaaka at Parliament with my mum, who turned out to be a great ‘research assistant’:

John Whaanga came over to talk to my mum. Mum introduced me and told me that John used to go to school with her brothers. She told him about my research and I told him that I was also learning to speak te reo after he said that he worked at Te Wānanga o Aotearoa. He seemed nice and gave me his email and phone number on a piece of paper, but I don’t know if that’s just because mum asked him to. – Fieldnotes 11.06.14

Later on in the year, during my stay in Nuhaka, my uncle asked me to stand at his side during his speech at his son’s twenty-first birthday. In doing so he let everyone know that I was staying with him for a few weeks and asked them to pop around for an interview with me. Shawn Wilson (2008) suggests that the use of family and friends as “intermediaries” in the contacting and engaging of contributors is a valuable tool when conducting research with Indigenous peoples. He explains that it has “practical uses in establishing rapport with research participants” whilst also “placing the researcher within a circle of relations” (129). He adds that “in addition to being a culturally appropriate way of approaching potential participants, the use of an intermediary gives the participant an opportunity to ask candid questions about the nature of the research and the motives behind it” (Wilson 2008, 129). Using whānau as intermediaries aligned with my aims to create a culturally safe environment for my contributors to the best of my abilities.

As well as encouraging me to establish and maintain reciprocal relationships based on familial ties and trust, the principle of whanaungatanga also made me answerable to those relationships. As a researcher I became accountable to the relationships that my research was based upon which meant prioritising the nurturing of them. This is not so different to what good non-Māori anthropologists would do, however accountability and reliance on whānau relationships rather than non-familial ones was the point of difference. On that note, my Rakaipaaka whakapapa was extremely valuable in establishing relationships with my contributors, but it did not necessarily grant me their trust or interview consent. This is where an extended stay in Nuhaka became very important. It was during this stay that I worked on re-establishing and nurturing my relationships with my contributors, visiting them when I could, offering them as much information about myself as they wanted, and taking part in community events where they could chat to me in more casual settings.

Manaakitanga

Manaakitanga is a concept which refers to the principles associated with care and reciprocity in relationships. It is also an important factor influencing the use and usefulness of research. One aim of Kaupapa Māori research is to make a difference by contributing positively to Māori development whilst validating Māori ways of being and doing (Bishop 1996). A number of authors have described the concerns Māori people feel about the impact of research into their lives which often focus on the locus of power and control over research issues (Bishop 1996, 14). These concerns are well-founded. Recent history has shown the terrible impacts that irresponsible researchers can have on Māori communities (Tuhiwai-Smith 1999), and the continued negative representations of Māori in mainstream media

understandably makes people wary (Kupu Taea 2014). Research is seen to have “conglomerated and commodified, Māori knowledge for ‘consumption’ by the colonisers and has consequently denied the authenticity of Māori experience and voice. Such research has displaced Māori lived experiences with the ‘authoritative’ voice of the ‘expert’ voiced in terms defined and determined by the ‘expert’” (Bishop 1996, 14). Such worries were expressed by my participants, not only in their wanting to know exactly who I was (and this meant how exactly I connected to Rakaipaaka) but also what I planned to do with the research. Part of putting my contributors at ease, and maintaining a relationship of mutual trust has been to keep in regular contact with them about my thesis, which has included a long-weekend stay in Nuhaka during which I discussed some of my preliminary findings with some of the contributors that live there.

Research Techniques

Shawn Wilson argues that “some methods and strategies have inherent in them more relationship building and relational accountability than others and therefore may be more attractive to an Indigenous paradigm” (Wilson 2008, 3). Thus, it can be understood that although Kaupapa Māori research does not have to use only Māori tools of methodological inquiry, it does have to use tools which Māori are comfortable with. For me this meant qualitative, life-focused data collection including interviews and participant observation which began with an extended stay with my whanau in Nuhaka in July 2014. During this time I conducted semi-structured interviews with self-identified Rakaipaaka descendants. It is these interviews alongside participant observation and online conversations, that helped shaped my research. Throughout the phase of data collection I always tried to adhere to seven guidelines which embody Kaupapa Māori. These are given by Smith as guidelines for Kaupapa Māori research:

1. Aroha ki te tangata (respect for people);
2. Kanohi kitea (the importance of meeting face-to-face);
3. Titiro, whakarongo . . . kōrero (look, listen . . . speak);
4. Manaaki ki te tangata (be generous, share and host people);
5. Kia tupato (be cautious);
6. Kaua takahia te mana o te tangata (do not trample the mana of the people);
7. Kaua e mahaki (do not flaunt your knowledge) (1999, 120).

The guideline ‘Kanohi kitea’ sometimes took a slightly different form - although many of my meetings were face-to-face, some conversations took place online (on Facebook messenger and over email). This type of communication often took place after meeting face-to-face however, and occurred with those I knew to be competent and comfortable online. Such an occurrence, I believe, is normal for many people in the contemporary context where online mediums are often used for communicative purposes. Nevertheless, I found these guidelines helpful in reminding me of my priorities.

Interviews

My original intentions in using interviews for this project were motivated by the wish for personal understandings of Rakaipaakatanga. Interviews are said to produce intimate and detailed accounts which offer a wealth of information (Holstein and Gubrium 2003, 3-6), something which I desired for this project. Accordingly, nine interviews were set up with ten contributors who agreed to take part in this

project; Esta Wainohu, Avon Raroa, Hana Whaanga, Irene Wesche, Hickson Raroa, Graeme Symes, Liz Hunkin, Tāmati Olsen, John Whaanga, and Koroniria¹⁵, who will now be referred to by their first names¹⁶. While most western research paradigms maintain the anonymity of contributors, many indigenous ones do not (Wilson 2008, 10). This is because there is an expectation of the contributor, based on the relational nature of indigenous research, that any information given, will be respected and used ethically by the researcher (Wilson 2008). Additionally, two of Smith's guidelines mentioned above - 'aroha ki te tangata' and 'kia tupato' – are expected by the contributors to be followed by the researcher in presentation of the information provided.

The interviews were with individuals or pairs and were conducted *kanohi ki te kanohi*, apart from one which the contributor asked to do over email. For all of the interviews I used a semi-structured format which meant that the list of questions I prepared beforehand were considered a guideline. If my contributors wanted to lead the discussion in a different direction they were most welcome to, as it was my intention to learn about their experiences and understandings. It was made clear that they could move away from the questions if they did not feel they could clearly express themselves, and additionally the questions that I did prepare were open-ended, and structured to allow a wide range of responses. Fontana and Frey explain that interviews with a less rigid structure allow researchers to “understand the complex behaviour of members of society without imposing any a priori categorization that may limit the field of inquiry” (1994, 366). This was reflected in the outcome of the interviews. In very general terms the casual structure of the interviews allowed contributors to discuss a range of topics including education, language, buildings, events and the Treaty of Waitangi with the over-arching theme of Rakaipaakatanga. I found the data gained from all interviews extremely valuable. However, as a result of the semi-structured and open-ended interviews, a wider range of data was collected, which clearly signalled the diversity within the collective experiences of the participants and their Rakaipaakatanga.

As already mentioned story-telling was a key component of the interviews conducted. My contributors regularly used stories to illustrate a point, to answer a question, or to evoke or re-experience certain emotions. As Russell Bishop (1996) explains “different stories give different versions of and approaches to the truth [and] as a result, stories allow the diversities of truth to be heard, rather than just one dominant version” (24). I welcomed story-telling as it was clear that contributors sometimes felt stories were the best way to express that which was difficult to explain. In addition, Bishop proposes that story-telling is a culturally preferred medium for imparting knowledge in Māori communities, a result of Māori oral tradition. He explains that “there is a *wairua*¹⁷ in story that binds the listener to the teller beyond any linkage created by words on their own” (1996, 25). Because storytelling was such a notable feature of my fieldwork I have used stories throughout my thesis as a way of keeping a sense of the diversity of those I talked with. Important to note, is the suggestion that storytelling is often associated with fiction. However, as Tim Ingold points out “[W]e should resist the temptation to assume that since stories are stories they are, in some sense, unreal or untrue, for this is to suppose that the only real reality, or true truth, is one in which we, as living, experiencing beings, can have no part at all” (Ingold 1993, 153).

In addition, the interviews I organised taught me valuable lessons about *whanaungatanga*. One example is of my first phone call to a potential contributor, Mrs Whaanga. The night before the phone call I had been talking to my aunty over, and long after, dinner. She had been telling me stories about Nuhaka, Rakaipaaka and the *tangata whenua*, listing names and phone numbers as she went - only ever giving the last four digits, because all phone numbers in Nuhaka start with the same three. Whilst on the

---

¹⁵ Koroniria preferred not to have his last name in the text.

¹⁶ Permission was given by each contributor to use their real names.

¹⁷ Spirit.

topic of Nuhaka School - an important part of the Rakaipaaka community, she mentioned Mrs Whaanga. I remembered the name from my mum talking about her. She had been my mum's teacher in Primmer 1, over fifty years ago and had taught all my uncles as well. Mrs Whaanga, now retired and now known as Hana, lived with her husband Ted just around the corner from where I was staying. Before moving onto her next story my aunty repeated their four-digit number insisting that Hana and Ted should be on my list of potential contributors. The next day after working myself up into an anxious state I pulled out the list of phone numbers and reached for the phone. Hana was the first person I called, and after a few rings, she answered –

'Hello', a lady answered.

'Kia ora, is this Hana Whaanga?' I said.

'Yes...'

'Kia ora Hana, my name is Hollie Russell and I'm a Masters student from Victoria University. I'm in Nuhaka at the moment and was wondering if I could please interview you for my research project which is about Rakaipaaka identity?'

After a few moments silence Hana answered, 'Have you tried Henare Mita? He knows more than me about Rakaipaaka'.

'He's on my list of people to contact' I said, 'but I want to talk to a few different people to hear about their experiences'

After a bit more silence Hana responded, 'Well I don't think I can help you, I don't know much about identity'

Trying to recover, I quickly replied, 'Oh, you don't have to know much about identity, I just want to hear stories about when you were growing up, your experiences, that kind of thing'

'Hmm well I don't think I can help you with that but I'll call you back' she replied.

'Okay that would be great. Thanks' I said, hanging up the phone – Fieldnotes 7.06.14

Cringing at my awkwardness I thought to myself that I really should have made a script for this phone-calling business. I had not told her who I was, at least not in the sense I know I should have: I did not mention my mum, my nan, or who I was staying with, and, like my supervisor Maria pointed out, I did not even say I was Māori. Without any relationships in which to situate myself to her, Hana did not know who I was, and whether I could be trusted. Skip forward a few hours and Hana called back asking me to come over. After being welcomed in to her home by her husband Ted, they sat me down on the couch and asked me how I was connected to Rakaipaaka and Nuhaka. Up until that point they had been friendly and welcoming, yet a little stand-offish (understandably so). As soon as I explained I was the mokopuna¹⁸ of Nanny Kiriwera and my connection to Rakaipaaka, they immediately became open books Hana remembered teaching my mum and my apparently cheeky uncles, and Ted remembered my dad from his visits to the Nuhaka Rugby Club. They also began opening books, including a special photo album which contained photos of Kahungunu Marae's carvings and the ancestral stories associated with them. The talking finished about two hours later with Hana and Ted telling me to come back before I went back to Wellington, an offer which I happily took them up on.

---

¹⁸ Grandchild.

Participant Observation

Participant observation is considered a hallmark of anthropological research (DeWalt and DeWalt 2011, 35) and was an important in helping me to contextualise what was expressed in the interviews, whilst at the same time providing me with additional valuable data. Wilson proposes that “traditional Indigenous research emphasizes learning by watching and doing [and] participant observation is a term used for this watching and doing in a scientific manner” (2008, 40). The aim of participant observation is to better understand the inner-workings of a group by participating in their activities. During this participation researchers are also expected to be observers, analysing the behaviour of that group (Wilson 2008, 40).

I used participant observation in both Nuhaka and Wellington throughout my research for multiple reasons. In Wellington, I attended the signing of the Agreement in Principle, which I have already mentioned was an important event for connecting with potential participants. In July I stayed in Nuhaka for three weeks, during which I stayed at Tane-nui-a-Rangi Marae, visited the urupā, ate boil up and hāngī, babysat my niece and nephew, worked at the kōhanga¹⁹, and made countless cups of tea. I also took part in an ice-bucket challenge at the fire station, attended my cousins twenty-first birthday and after-party at the local rugby club, and shovelled out sheds at a local quail farm. It is also when I conducted the majority of my interviews, which because of my stay, were able to be conducted in the homes of my contributors where they felt comfortable. A really valuable part of my extended stay and the participant observation I did was that I got to see Rakaipaakatanga in action, in Nuhaka – the inner workings of the marae, the feeling of being in my tūrangawaewae²⁰, the manaakitanga present in every visit I made, the use of te reo Māori, and the embodiment of whakataukī and ancestral stories. I also got to see the challenges faced by those living in the rohe and see some of the ways they attempted to overcome them.

Another important element of this period, was the informal conversations I got to have with my whānau, whilst making dinner, over dinner, doing the dishes and much longer into the night. It was during these conversations that I received important information that sometimes I had not even considered or thought to ask about. I went back to Nuhaka again in November 2014 for a long weekend to talk to some of my contributors about what I had done so far and to attend Rakaipaaka Day, a day set up by a local Rakaipaaka community leader to promote unity and community in Nuhaka. Again, the informal conversations and responses to my work so far were extremely important, and the feeling of being home amongst my whānau was the re-energising I needed to finish this thesis.

Online

Although interviews and participant observation were my main methods of enquiry I also found Rakaipaaka’s online presence to be an important source of information. In 2001 Michael Christie suggested that the internet would open up greater possibilities for Indigenous peoples to “speak for themselves”, providing more freedom for them to be writers of their own stories (47). More recently, Bronwyn Lumby has said that for Indigenous people’s technology such as Facebook “provides possibilities for extending community, for establishing connectedness and cultural belonging” (2010,

---

¹⁹ Language learning nest.

²⁰ A Māori concept which literally means “a standing place for feet” or “a place to stand” (Kidman 2012, 193) referring to a sense of connection to the land through kinship and whakapapa.

69). For example, since its conception Māori have used Facebook to express global citizenship whilst continuing to uphold local cultural identities. Furthermore, it has allowed Māori, alongside other Indigenous groups, to build, display, and perform their identities in their own way. One Facebook page, Te Iwi o Rakaipaaka, has 1,040 members and acts as a modern site for kinship continuity and connections, where members regularly (re)connect with whānau, collect old stories and pictures and reinvigorate iwi identity. The page was created as a possible means to gather names for an ancestral database, and members often post photo's asking for the people in them to be named. Hobson and Cook explain that "with an emphasis on collaboration, participation, interaction, and networking, social media fits well within a Māori framework kaupapa" (2011, 1). With a focus of kaupapa Māori being the establishing and nurturing of relationships social media, including Facebook, "can complement face-to-face communication within Māori and indigenous communities" (Hobson and Cook 2011, 1). Accordingly, after gaining Victoria University Human Ethics Committee approval one of the first things I did was make a post on this community Facebook page. After introducing myself, including references to my tīpuna²¹, I briefly described my research project and welcomed anyone who was interested to message me on Facebook or email me at the address I provided. I included a photograph of my mum, nanny and koro²² in the post too, as the page is often used to share photos. Although I got a lot of positive feedback in regards to the photo, and comments from others wishing me luck on my journey I only connected with one contributor through this means. However, the page overall was useful offering a perfect opportunity to gather data relating to how Rakaipaakatanga is expressed and articulated with many different members of the group posting regularly. Some discussion on the page also offered insight into the tension surrounding different models of community and belonging.

---

²¹ Ancestors/Grandparents. Tipuna without the macron on the 'i' refers to singular ancestor or grandparent.

²² Grandfather.

Theoretical Framework – The Koru

In line with the aims of my thesis I wanted a theoretical framework that recognised and celebrated both the similarities and diversity inherent in collective identity; I wanted to be able to highlight complexity without contradicting unity; I wanted to write about cultural lives as intertwined with structural forces; and most importantly, I wanted it to privilege a Māori worldview, Māori understandings, and Māori ways of being in the world. This led me to the koru, which here represents a collaboration between Kaupapa Māori and the idea of Becoming. The use of the koru as framework for research has been used many times before this. For example, Erina Okeroa (2013) uses the koru in her work on the Black Women's Movement in Aotearoa New Zealand. Here, she uses the koru as a metaphor for "roots and routes" in identity and identification. 'Roots and routes' also used by Stuart Hall (1990), Paul Gilroy (1993) and Elizabeth Deloughrey (2007) for research with diaspora's, refers to, in Okeroa's work, the koru as a metaphor. Okeroa writes, "In particular, while the roots of the koru are grounded yet fertile, the unfurling koru frond reveals what might be described a spiralled series of routes as it spreads out in different directions . . . importantly, the koru needs sustenance from both its rooted position in the earth, and from external elements such as water, sunlight and air. Consequently, the koru as metaphor describes the process of identification, as a series of routes taken from a fixed root" (2007, 67-68).

For me this framework addresses some of the issues that are raised with more static identity frameworks which have previously dominated anthropological discourse, and which continue to hold power in Aotearoa New Zealand's national consciousness. A spiral shape that is regularly used in Māori art, the koru is based on the shape of an unfurling fern frond, and symbolises "creation, change, continuation, renewal and hope" (Dana and Hipango Jr. 2011, 202). As outlined, its circular growth represents the idea of movement whilst its inward coil suggests a return to the point of origin making the koru a symbol for the way in which life changes and stays the same (Sheehan 2013).

23

Because of its qualities, the koru was a good metaphor for the framework collaboration used here. It incorporated the movement associated with Becoming, and as an important Māori symbol made reference to the privileging of a Māori worldview. Before discussing the koru framework, this chapter will begin with an overview of the understandings of iwi, hapū and Māori identity that have been pervasive in anthropological discourse about Māori. These discourses have often promoted a narrow and rigid understanding of these groupings, an issue this framework responds to.

---

²³ Left image: Art work by Theresa Reihana titled *Hoki Mai*, depicting the use of koru in Māori art. Right image: Art work by Angie Dennis titled *Koru* depicting the unfurling fern frond which the koru shape is based on.

Anthropological Understandings of Māori Social Organisation

Pre-colonisation, Māori society was structured into descent based kin groups whose formation was often centred on ancestors and past events (Maaka 2003, 21). These groups of whānau, hapū, and iwi, were not completely distinct. Instead “the lines between them were blurred and amorphous, with their size and functions varying widely from region to region” (Barcham 1998, 304). Christina González describes these social groupings as being in “a perpetual state of metamorphosis” (2010, 21). She argues that contrary to the idea that iwi consists of distinct hapū units and hapū of distinct whānau units, groups were “constantly being reconfigured according to circumstance” (23). One metaphor used by Jeffrey Sissons to describe this 18th century social organisation is that of a kaleidoscope – “hundreds of *hapū* which were forming, disappearing, dividing and forging numerous alliances with each other” (2004, 24). Evan Poata-Smith describes the fluidity and dynamism of hapū as normal. Human affairs such as marriage, migration, disagreement and conflict among whānau meant the boundaries between social groupings were not always static (2004, 173). It is also true that, pre-colonisation, hapū were the dominant form of Māori social organisation rather than iwi which often hold that position today. Iwi in the 18th century rarely assembled and when they did it was usually for a set and shared purpose, such as periods of external invasion, land confiscation or warfare. However, in times of relative stability iwi were seemingly non-existent (González 2010, 22). This is often ignored in current non-Māori discourse where the recognition of iwi as the dominant social grouping of contemporary Māori social organisation has been extended to suggest the same presence of iwi, historically. By the mid-19th century existing iwi were considered to be a centuries-old “political unit occupying and defending a continuous territory inside a known, tribal boundary” (Ballara 1998, 18), and “what is often called ‘traditional Māori society’, [is] too often understood to refer to society at any and all times before 1769” (Ballara 1998, 20). My decision to employ the koru framework was partly in response to these misconceptions which can still be seen in Aotearoa New Zealand today.

In her chapter ‘The Scholars and the Grand Design’ Angela Ballara traces the origins of this misguided understanding of traditional Māori social structure which underlies many New Zealander’s perceptions (1998, 19). This understanding is a result of popular works written by late 19th-early 20th century ethnologists who endorsed “rigid and static structural models”, the design of which was motivated by the popular search for a grand design (Ballara 1998, 95). Ballara gives this example:

Where did anyone go who wanted to know how Māori society worked? . . . Most often they would probably go to some popular source such as A.D. McLintock’s governmentsponsored *Encyclopaedia of New Zealand*, published in 1966. There, under Māori ‘traditional social structure’, they would learn that ‘the Māori tribe (iwi)’ was essentially a large, territorially based social unit, consisting at contact probably of ‘several thousands’; it was also the largest political unit . . . A list of nine canoes was associated with [them], and the statement was made that the people descended from the captain or crews of these canoe considered themselves to be linked by common origin . . . For most political purposes the effective unit was the hapū or sub-tribe, whose functions were the control and defence of a specific territory. The lands of the hapū were divided into sections, each administered by smaller social units caused by whānau or extended, three-generational families, which operated as the day-to-day economic unit (1998, 106-107).

While there did exist alternative accounts, often written by explorers and missionaries, the perception that iwi could be subdivided into fixed and distinct hapū had greater appeal to late 19th century scholars (Ballara 1998, 93). Furthermore, the widespread recognition and popularity of their work was an

important influence on the perceptions of many New Zealanders. As Ballara explains “their ideas about Māori origins, history and social structure were not seriously queried until the 1920s, and many are still popular (Ballara 1998, 95). During his interview, Tāmāti acknowledged the continued popularity of the distinct and rigid social structure idea, exclaiming “just because we say we’re Rakaipaaka doesn’t mean we’re not Ngāti Kahungunu – we are. But the way people think these days, you can only be one or the other”. There are many like Tāmāti that resist this misconception, including many Māori who identify several different iwi in their pēpeha²⁴.

The solidification of iwi, prompted by anthropologists and historians of the time, and readily taken up by government officials, including some Māori, was reflected in conceptions of iwi identity. Restricting the ‘kaleidoscope’ nature of iwi and hapū formation helped to make Māori identity static, creating an either/or definition of what it is to be Māori. Here, the Treaty of Waitangi Act (1975) and subsequent Amendment Act (1985) are a point of focus. Manuhua Barcham argues that the Amendment Act was a main driver in the “re-iwi-isation” of Māori peoples – “the Act allowed for claims by Māori under the Treaty of Waitangi to be backdated to 1840, which meant in everyday terms that the tribal groups and territories acknowledged by the law are those that existed in 1840” (1998, 306). Likewise, González argues that the way the Waitangi Tribunal works “compresses past and present into a single unit”, requiring Māori to prove their tribe’s unchanging nature to engage in the settlement process (2010, 25). She also refers to the Iwi Rūnanga Act (1990), which although short-lived, upheld and embedded the idea of the iwi as the desired medium for Māori development (2010, 26; see also Maaka 2003). This led the successive New Zealand government to the “conclusion that only traditional kin-based Iwi were Treaty partners” (Barcham 2000:141). Barcham argues that static and rigid forms of Māori identity which are promoted by political and judicial frameworks in Aotearoa New Zealand such as the Amendment Act assumes that “bodies (be they concrete or abstract, singular or plural) exist in an ahistorical essentialism . . . thereby effectively excluding any chance of recognising notions of social transformation and change”, alienating those Māori whose “identity is shaped more by the aftermath of colonialism and their disadvantaged position in New Zealand society than in terms of a traditionorientated model of ‘authentic’ identity” (2000, 138). Essentially, these frameworks promote a dichotomy of ‘being’ and ‘non-being’ which ignores the process of becoming.

Barcham explains however, that it was not just the Treaty of Waitangi and colonial agendas that ‘froze’ Māori social groupings; it was also partly motivated by the actions of Māori elites, who solidified the social structure in an attempt to hinder continued assimilation and loss of culture (1998, 306). This re-iwi-isation period, where iwi became widely recognised and accepted as a representation of ‘traditional’ Māori society, corresponded with an “iwi cultural renaissance” where the notion of iwitanga²⁵ strengthened (González 2010, 28). Underlying this notion of iwitanga was a privileging of tribal identity and tribal belonging over a more generalised Māori identity, in turn promoting “tribal awareness, knowledge and pride, and the assertion of historic tribal difference within Māoridom” (González 2010, 28). González considers prominent Māori leaders, such as Tipene O’Regan, who proclaimed their tribal affiliations as the focus point of their cultural identity over a more general Māori label (González 2010, 28). Such an idea was sometimes reflected in interviews as well:

What does [being Rakaipaaka] mean for me? It adequately reflects who I really am, my whakapapa. That’s what the essence of it is for me ... it gives me a solid point of connection. Hard for me ... to connect to Ngāti Kahungunu – Where? What part? Ngāti Kahungunu ki Te Wairoa. Oh okay that can be anyone of 36 different marae, and one of 188 hapū up

---

²⁴ A proverb that displays the cultural history of the speaker (discussed in depth in Chapter Four: Rakaipaakatanga).

²⁵ Iwi Identity.

there you know but actually if you get me to focus in there I know that my stomping ground goes from Opoho to Waikokopu, to the Wharerata – Tāmati.

However, promoting distinctive tribal identities often brought into question Māori who did not affiliate with iwi. The ideas espoused by Māori leaders, albeit as a way of resisting the homogenisation of Māori, meant that “to be authentically Māori [was] really to ‘be tribal’” (González 2010, 28). Consequently, the model of distinct and fixed tribal units was maintained. Māori identity became synonymous with iwi identity, and the authenticity of individuals who professed to be Māori was judged against traditional markers of Māori identity - whakapapa, engagement with marae and whānau, a connection to ancestral land and competence in te reo Māori (González 2010 28-29). This excluded some Māori whose alternative experiences meant they did not fulfil these requirements. As Robert Joseph outlines, debates “on the definition and meaning of Māori identity and representation often cynically focuses on determining whether or not Māori are authentically representing traditional Māori beliefs and practices – questioning their Māoriness, as it were – as observed, recorded and described by anthropologists from outside Māori culture” (2012, 153). This had important effects for non-iwi affiliated Māori and the Urban Māori authorities who sometimes represented them, who were largely ignored by successive governments who favoured relationships with ‘traditional’ iwi structures (Rangiheuea 2010, 187). The Rūnanga Iwi Act, for example, expressed not only the exclusive behaviour of some ‘traditional’ iwi representatives but also “the Crown’s . . . archaic definition of Māori social structure that was far removed from the modern realities of Māori society” (Rangiheuea 2010, 193).

Important to note is that it is not only those Māori who are disconnected from their iwi who are affected by the restrictive nature of the ‘traditional’ iwi mould. Those that are iwi-affiliated also feel the effects of having to fit into strict boxes. For example “for [some] Māori who are aware of their whakapapa and tribal connections, there is even greater expectancy to meet and ‘perform’ . . . qualifying attributes, including those peculiar to their particular tribes. Often, if they do not meet those cultural expectations they are seen by tribal members as less ‘authentic’ and [accordingly] thought to be unworthy of full tribal participation” (González 2010, 29). Another example is the Foreshore and Seabed Act of 2004²⁶ where threshold tests “redefined Māori communities out of existence” by upholding idealistic understandings of *traditional* identity and social organisation which was used to check the authenticity of *contemporary* Māori groups (Joseph 2012, 153). Authenticity threshold tests, like this, ignore that processes such as colonisation, urbanisation and globalisation can affect Māori communities and identity (Joseph 2012, 153). Tāmati articulated views of the same nature:

That’s what I mean about getting trapped in time. If you think about the emergence of Ngāti Kahungunu, it came out of all the land conferences that were happening, where you had these tīpuna who all had mana in their own right . . . Iwi was not a word that was known pre-Pākehā, we were just hapū. And we all knew our whanaunga²⁷, our whakapapa links and all of that, and the same goes for Rakaipaaka. But with all of those conferences [our] tīpuna got together and they said ‘we sort of have to find some mutual space that we can call ourselves, because you know I got too much mana, you got too much mana’. That’s when they sat down, wānanga²⁸, and came up with the idea - ‘oh Kahungunu, he’s a tīpuna that we all whakapapa too, that’s what we are. We are Ngāti Kahungunu’. But they were Ngāti Kahungunu for the period that they were together eh, and when they dispersed they went back to what they were, Ngāti Rakaipaaka, Ngāti Pahauwera [etcetera]. But we got

---

²⁶ Now repealed.

²⁷ Extended family.

²⁸ Educational seminar, conference, forum.

trapped there, we became trapped there in that top bit and as a result it's had an effect on our identities below that.

The theoretical framework of my thesis is in response to these static and sometimes inflexible conceptions of iwi and iwitanga which have dominated anthropological discourse and mainstream understandings and which continue to have influence today over Māori and iwi identity.

Becoming

The interesting thing is that in our philosophies your learning starts from the point of conception, not birth. From the point of your conception you are learning until the day you die. So I would absolutely agree that you are refining your understanding, you are building your understanding, you get more comfortable with your understanding of who you are as Rakaipaaka over time, and I don't think you're ever quite finished with that. Just in the same way that you're never quite finished understanding how you connect with other people, those are always things you can add to . . . it's not ending – John.

Important for me and my contributors in framing this thesis was the idea that Rakaipaaka are as much a tribe of the present as they are of the past and future, a notion which strongly influenced Rakaipaakatanga. The Becoming framework embraces this idea by considering the past, present and future as intertwined (González 2010; Sissons 2013; Peters and Andersen 2013). The Becoming framework is explored in the work of Tim Ingold who suggests that that which is described as having life, or of being alive cannot be seen as objects that already exist outside the environment they are in, or the relationships they are a part of. Instead, life and identity are things which are “inherent in the very process of the world's continual generation or coming-into-being” (Ingold 2011, 10). Life and identity can be thought of in terms of a person's involvement in the world which extends along multiple pathways that grow, move and intertwine to make up the meshwork²⁹ of the world. Identity is not some sort of static force within a being, but rather a process that occurs as meshworks interweave, as they *become* (Ingold 2011, 13-14). González uses the idea of Becoming to visualise Kahungunu identity as a conjoining of Kahungunu uniformity and Kahungunu difference “to articulate Kahungunu forms ... [which] are not bound to any one particular shape”. Instead, she explains, “they expand or deflate, mould and flex to assume various shapes and sizes for and by their surroundings”. As Kahungunu forms they carry indications of Kahungunu history, marks of present Kahungunu, and contort to possible Kahungunu futures of which there are multiple possibilities (2010, 62). Wally Penetito, in a similar vein, notes that “there are multiple ways of being Māori” (2011, 40), an idea which the Becoming framework acknowledges, allowing me to consider Rakaipaakatanga as intertwined with the past, present and future.

An important consequence of using this Becoming framework to discuss identity, is that it might be suggested that 'becoming' Rakaipaaka negates the idea of already being Rakaipaaka. This is not the case. It is the growth and reconfiguring of different relationships over time that allows individuals to *become* Rakaipaaka whilst *being* Rakaipaaka. Adaption and development from a point of origin does not always redefine something – just because a koru grows does not mean it is not a koru. However, in using the idea of Becoming as part of my theoretical framework I do hope to give a sense of the dynamism,

---

²⁹ The term 'meshwork' is discussed in depth in Chapter Four: Rakaipaakatanga – Whakapapa.

complexity and movement of tribal identity. Māori social organisation has always been dynamic, continuously modifying itself in response to its environment (Barcham 1998, 307). Barcham explains that Māori “developed new forms of social institutions and forms of social interaction in response to exposure to a new foreign environment in which the effectiveness of former traditional structures was lessened” (1998, 307). He goes on to explain that those new forms were often logical responses to the changing environment and did not necessarily mean that Māori had “given in” or given up (1998, 307). Adaption was a valid reaction but anthropologists who continued to endorse static understandings of iwi and hierarchical conceptions of iwi failed to recognise this. They regarded Māori society as “internally static and self-maintaining”, discounting that Māori society “was not fixed and final [at first contact], but was only the latest stage in an ongoing adjustment to its own changing environment” (Ballara 1998, 33). Ballara concedes that “often, in past studies of tribal society, long periods of relative stability have been mistaken for permanence” (Ballara 1998, 33).

Nonetheless, “Māori never were and are not a unified, homogenous group, amenable to a ‘one-size-fits-all’ characterisation” (Joseph 2012, 152). The diversity and complexity inherent in being Māori is obvious. Many Māori do have certain common features of identity but there is certainly no one Māori reality and research with Māori should not suggest so. As Witi Ihimaera suggests Māori are not what their ancestors were, and neither will their descendants be who they are, because Māori are not “replicas” of one another but diverse and unique individuals (1998, 259). Joanna Kidman (2012) proposes the same, arguing that new forms of identity should not be contrasted to older forms and that a recognition of dynamism as well as consistency is important. In her work Kidman found that young Māori were making “active choices about what constituted Indigenous identity and ethnicity as they understood it within the shifting political and economic contexts ... blend[ing] their interpretations of “tradition” ... with contemporary cultural dilemmas and situations ... [generating] new understandings” of iwi identity (Kidman 2012, 198). This idea is not limited to Māori either – George Morgan looks at contemporary forms of Aboriginal Identity in his work *Unsettled Places* proposing that “Aboriginality incorporates the possibility of cultural change as well as continuity . . . [It] is not simply a vestige of something that has survived from the past”, it persists through a negotiation between old and new (2006, 142-3). Considering identity as such means the complexities and variations of the Rakaipaaka community can enhance understandings of the iwi rather than redefine it out of existence.

Kaupapa Māori

The Becoming framework helps to illuminate some important ideas, however it has its limits. Considering it through the lens of Kaupapa Māori has allowed me to resolve some of these. To begin, the use of the Becoming framework has potential political consequences, particularly for a group that is dealing with the strict criteria used against iwi in Treaty settlements. Pre- European contact, the word ‘Māori’ simply meant normal or usual and there was no definitive concept of ‘Māori’ identity (Joseph 2012, 152). Joseph, in his chapter ‘Unsettling Treaty Settlements’ (2012) argues that it was European contact, including “the contrast of newcomers’ culture”, which motivated Māori to emphasise a panMāori identity rather than tribal difference. However, as he explains, non-Māori had some difficulty tolerating a strong Māori cultural presence, perhaps because it did not align with their assumptions of assimilation. This has led to “a political, cultural and academic debate” regarding the definition of Māori identity which often focuses on proving authenticity through the fulfilment of certain criteria. Joseph, explores the use of this criteria which has often held contemporary Māori up against historical counterparts. He argues its use by government officials, as well as anthropologists, to test the ‘authenticity’ of Māori,

looked to “define or re-define Indigenous Peoples in order to strip them of their identity and consequently of their land and resources” (2012, 153). Examples such as the Foreshore and Seabed Act of 2004 and the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act of 2011 illustrate the very real consequences of these criteria. Notions of fluidity and change that are prevalent in the Becoming framework can be used against Māori in this respect. However, if the Becoming framework is considered through a Kaupapa Māori lens change can be embraced in a way that does not work to the detriment of Māori or Māori identity. Kaupapa Māori as “the deconstruction of hegemonies which have disempowered Māori from controlling and defining their own knowledge . . . in New Zealand” (Bishop 1996, 13), asserts the goal of allowing Māori to control Māori culture, aspirations and destiny. Thus, change and adaption in Māori identity which could signal illegitimacy or inauthenticity, can instead signal the inability of criteria to recognise logical and valid response to changes in the environment.

A second limit to the Becoming framework is that its emphasis on movement can sometimes ignore those things that stay the same. Using the Kaupapa Māori lens helps me to value and acknowledge the place of tradition and sameness in Māori society and Māori identity. Moana Jackson suggests that for Māori, history is made up of “repetitious beginnings” (2007, 173). He goes on to propose that

Each new event, each generation of ideas and actions that shape human lives is a product of those that have gone before. Nothing exists in isolation or arises spontaneously in a vacuum of immaculate conception. Instead, the present and future are only the past revisited – ka puta mai – things come into being, are born of something else. When Māori people speak of the past as I ngā rā o mua, we know it is the days before and that we carry them with us, rather like walking back to the future with history dogging our footsteps. That understanding is not quite the same as the wisdom in the old adage that the more things change, the more they stay the same, because history is naturally an evolution of sorts. However, there is a prescience in history and the present, a sense that comprehending [the present] means seeking out the symmetries and similarities with the past (2007, 173).

Considering the Becoming framework through a Kaupapa Māori lens which privileges Māori understandings like these means tradition and sameness *as well as* movement and change are acknowledged and celebrated as part of being Māori, and for this thesis, being Rakaipaaka. Additionally, the koru is again an appropriate metaphor, symbolising the ways in which life changes and stays the same. It reflects an understanding of change and sameness, not as binary opposites but as processes, which blend into each other.

Finally, in moving away from more static and rigid identity frameworks I am not intending to suggest they do not have their place in discussions of Māori identity, nor am I suggesting they are always used *against* Māori. In fact, there are some great benefits to their use, including the examples previously discussed regarding Māori elites, who solidified the social structure as a way of obstructing continued assimilation and culture loss (Barcham 1998, 306). Nevertheless, the advantages of this collaborative koru framework are valuable here. The framework allows me to accommodate for the diversity and complexity of Rakaipaaka lives; it allows me to “reconcile the commonalities of identity with the dissimilarities of experience to demonstrate different but valid ‘manifestations of be(com)ing’” (González 2010, 7); and it allows me to address the ways in which people are shaped and influenced by the traditions and environments they belong to. In her article ‘Ngā rakau a te Pākehā: reconsidering Māori Anthropology’, Amiria Henare makes reference to recent publications which she suggests “appear to share a view that, since colonization, Māori have progressively lost that which made them distinct from

their colonizers, becoming assimilated” (2006, 4). The koru framework allows me to challenge this by highlighting the natural dynamism and adaptive capabilities of Māori, and in this case Rakaipaaka.

Rakaipaakatanga

---

*“What does being Rakaipaaka mean to you?” I asked.
Hickson thought for a moment then answered,
“Everything. It means to be alive, to know who you are. . .
Being Rakaipaaka’s everything I think.”*

Ko Moumoukai tōku maunga, ko Ngā Nuhaka tōku awa, ko Ngāti Rakaipaaka tōku iwi. Moumoukai is my mountain, Ngā Nuhaka is my river, Rakaipaaka is my iwi. To define my identity is to say my pēpeha. It is a way of affirming my whakapapa, my tūrangawaewae, my place in the scheme of the world. Pēpeha display the cultural histories of their speaker and the foundations of their identity – whenua, whakapapa, and language. On the surface they display knowledge of iwi boundaries through the naming of specific and special geographical features, refer to tribal authorities and display some level of te reo Māori fluency. As Arapera Ngaha points out, “knowing the various elements of pēpeha signals a level of understanding of local identity” (2014, 88). However, the importance of pēpeha does not only lie in the knowledge of names, but also of the stories that lie behind those names and therefore “the cultural principles that guide behaviour, explain the association of ancestors with places, or identify important trusteeship principles in respect of particular places” (Ngaha 2014, 88-89).

Ko Moumoukai tōku maunga, ko Ngā Nuhaka tōku awa refers to the land and waterways over which Rakaipaaka descendants hold mana whenua³⁰. Moumoukai, the ancestral mountain of Rakaipaaka descendants stands at just over 600 metres high and separates the Nuhaka and Morere valleys. It was upon this maunga³¹ that Rakaipaaka established himself and exerted his control over the surrounding district. Moumoukai literally means ‘to waste food’. The name comes from an incident that occurred in 1824 when the mountain pā³² came under attack from Ngā Puhi warriors led by Pōmare (Whaanga 2004). Despite the superior firepower of Ngā Puhi, they could not break the defences of the pā, and nor could they starve the Rakaipaaka people out. This was because the hill-top pā had an abundance of food and was supplied with water from a spring. It is also said that underground caves enabled Rakaipaaka people to travel secretly out of the pā to fishing grounds on the coast. Thus, it was the attackers who ended up short of food. Adding insult to injury, Koroniria, in his interview explained that “our people taunted Ngā Puhi by throwing kai scraps over the hill, down on Ngā Puhi who were, by this time, hungry and demoralised”, hence the name Moumoukai.

Ngā Nuhaka, Koroniria explained in his interview, is the full name of a female descendant of Ruawharo, a senior tohunga³³ on the Takitimu waka. Ngā Nuhaka as a feature of the landscape also holds many stories. One is of a taniwha³⁴ who is seen as a guardian of the entire Nuhaka district. The taniwha was known to take many forms – koura, shark, tuna, and a log – but was believed to always take the form of a tuna when in the Nuhaka area (Mita 2011, 9). The story is told that many years ago the body of a young boy who had drowned in the river was found in a tree. As people approached the tree they

---

³⁰ Territorial rights, power associated with possession and occupation of tribal land.

³¹ Mountain.

³² Fortified village.

³³ Skilled person, expert said to be chosen by the Atua.

³⁴ Powerful water spirit.

saw a tuna³⁵ disappearing into a creek that ran into the river. Elders said that the taniwha had found the boy and put him in the tree for the people to find (Mita 2011, 9).

Ko Ngāti Rakaipaaka tōku iwi refers to the ancestor Rakaipaaka and the wider iwi who descend from him. Rakaipaaka descended from Tamatea Ariki Nui, the captain of the Takitimu waka, and is the grandson of the famous chief Kahungunu (see community profile in Introduction). Rakaipaaka settled with his wife Turumakina around the Waerenga a Hika District, however, an incident with Tutekohi (a well-known chief of that area) made it impossible for Rakaipaaka, his sister and their whānau to continue living in the area. The story begins with an invitation for Rakaipaaka to visit Tutekohi. When Rakaipaaka and his people arrived at Tutekohi's pā they were treated as guests of honour and a meal was prepared. However, once the meal was served Tutekohi gave the best of the food to his dog, Kauere-huani, who was also allowed to eat at, and roam on, the table. This was considered extremely offensive and insulting but Rakaipaaka and his people contained their disgust and returned home. After dark however, one of Rakaipaaka's men who was still angered by Tutekohi's failure as a host, led a group back to the pā. When they found the dog sleeping outside they killed it, carried it home and then ate it. Once the sun had risen, Tutekohi realised his dog was missing and, convinced it was one of Rakaipaaka's men, looked to seek revenge. He approached Mahaki, the first cousin of Rakaipaaka, for help. It was known that one of Rakaipaaka's men, Tupuho, had slept with Mahaki's wife so it did not take long for Tutekohi to convince him to join forces. After much violent fighting Rakaipaaka and his men were defeated and a great number killed. Rakaipaaka's life was spared because of his relationship to Mahaki but only on the condition that he and his family leave the district. After leaving, Rakaipaaka took the coastal route to Mahia, his ancestral home. From here he journeyed to Nuhaka, and followed the Nuhaka River up to make his new home on the great Moumoukai (Mitira 1972).

As can be seen, even short and simple pēpeha express a considerable amount of information about the speaker to the listener. They carry the history and cultural foundations of the speaker and their identity (Ngaha 2014, 88). Ngaha explains that "having that level of knowledge about where you belong, or come from, is one level of cultural identification. . . Knowing these few elements is the beginning of knowing and understanding your place in the world: the Māori world" (2014, 88). Provided they have someone to teach them, many Māori children are taught to recite their pēpeha from a young age. However as Margaret Mutu explains, understanding and appreciating the full depth of pēpeha takes many years of training (Mutu 2005, 120). This experience was expressed by a few of my contributors too:

I always knew we were Māori, but I didn't really know everything, I knew we were Rakaipaaka, like I would say my pēpeha but didn't know what it meant. It wasn't until I was a bit older – Hickson.

My understanding of whakapapa and tribal-ness in a way is something that I think became a bit more refined later on . . . I think to start with I would have defined myself as coming from Nuhaka. That's not to say I didn't know Rakaipaaka, but if you're saying to me what would be the first thing I'd say if someone said 'where you from?' I would've said Nuhaka . . . I grew up knowing what my maunga was, I grew up knowing what my awa was, that's unquestionable, I grew up knowing my marae from a very early stage. But things like whakapapa, I learnt a lot of that later on – John.

---

³⁵ Eel.

Ko Moumoukai tōku maunga, ko Ngā Nuhaka tōku awa, ko Ngāti Rakaipaaka tōku iwi. These are the foundations of Rakaipaakatanga and to be Rakaipaaka is to begin with these foundations – whenua, whakapapa and spoken in te reo Māori. However, this does not mean Rakaipaaka are only these things. Rather, to be Rakaipaaka is to be like a koru, where there is both a point of origin as well as growth and movement from that place. The koru as a symbol for the way in which life changes and stays the same makes it a valuable metaphor here, whilst at the same time recognising that to consider change and movement in identity does not delegitimise or invalidate it.

The question of what it meant to be Rakaipaaka was often met by my contributors with thoughtful but bemused expressions. Putting into words what it meant to be Rakaipaaka was difficult because, like Hickson exclaimed, it was everything. Articulating it here, I have often faced the same challenge, not knowing how to put Rakaipaakatanga into words. However with the understanding that pēpeha are a carrier of the foundations of identity they seem a good place to start. Partnering this with the koru representing movement from a point of origin, and thus an acceptance of diversity, has made articulation possible. Human affairs, and in particular for this thesis, conceptions of identity are inherently diverse, even when it is a collective identity being discussed, and it was actually the assumption that research is done to simplify and synthesise that created barriers. Thus, I start with three sections – whenua, whakapapa, and language as foundations of identity for Rakaipaaka people. In reality these distinctions are not actually that distinct, something that can be seen clearly throughout this section, but they will serve for the time being. Within each of these sections I will discuss how each foundation acts as an element of Rakaipaakatanga.

The koru framework does not only help to express Rakaipaaka understandings of these foundations, it also helps to argue that the effects of colonisation do not signal the assimilation or disappearance of Māori or Māori identity. Instead, it helps to show that adaption and development from a point of origin does not always make something illegitimate or inauthentic – just because a koru grows does not mean it is not a koru.

Whenua

We go ‘oh hello, who are you?’ You know that’s the Māori way, like ‘oh who’s your whānau? Who’s your tīpuna?’ and I love that way, how it connects to our maunga, and how we recognise our identity through landscapes and elements – Irene

In ‘Temporality of the Landscape’ Ingold writes what Māori have understood for centuries, that “the landscape is constituted as an enduring record of – and testimony to – the lives and works of past generations who have dwelt within it, and in so doing, have left there something of themselves. . . [T]he landscape tells – or rather *is* – a story. It enfolds the lives and times of predecessors who, over the generations, have moved around in it and played their part in its formation” (1993, 152). Land is fundamental to Māori identity. As Jim Williams explains “it is much more than a mere resource; it is a large part of Māori *mana*³⁶ as well as being the primary ancestor; it embodies the past and, at the same time, is the foundation for future generations” (2004, 50). Mason Durie similarly argues that although ownership may change, land itself cannot be made to disappear nor can it be separated from the lives and deaths of people for whom it has been home, or for whom it should have been home (1998, 115).

---

³⁶ Power, prestige.

As he goes on to explain, “Māori identity is secured by land; land binds human relationships, and in turn people learn to bond with the land. Loss of land is loss of life, or at least loss of that part of life which depends on the connections between the past and the present and the present with the future” (1998, 115). The notion is captured in a quote from Paerau Warbrick, who states, “Whenua . . . is inextricably linked with Māori identity: if you understand whenua then you will understand Māori” (2012, 92). This aligns with many in the Rakaipaaka community for whom whenua is considered an integral part of who they have been, who they are, and who they will be.

Dwelling

Like many other iwi, Rakaipaaka considers its whenua in terms of historically and culturally “significant phenomena, events, sites and geographic features” (The Ngāti Rakaipaaka Story 2014, 4). As expressed in the Ngāti Rakaipaaka story presented to Crown representatives, the whenua of the rohe is “rich with history, taonga³⁷, natural resources, assets and kōrero³⁸. Rivers, moana³⁹, springs, fountains, land, the natural resources and environment have been the mauri⁴⁰, life and sustenance for the tribe of Ngāti Rakaipaaka and always will be” (2014, 4). Ingold presents a similar understanding of land which he argues is in opposition to “the naturalistic view of the landscape as a neutral, external backdrop to human activities, and the culturalistic view that every landscape is a particular cognitive or symbolic ordering of space”. Instead it aligns with what he calls a “dwelling perspective” in which the temporality of the landscape is the focus (1993, 152).

According to Ingold, the dwelling perspective views the landscape as intimately intertwined with the lives that have been lived in it over time (1993, 152). Through a dwelling perspective it can be understood that “[a] place owes its character to the experiences it affords to those who spend time there – to the sights, sounds and indeed smells that constitute its specific ambience. And these, in turn, depend on the kinds of activities in which its inhabitants engage. It is from this relational context of people’s engagement with the world, in the business of dwelling, that each place draws its unique significance” (Ingold 1993, 155). In other words, the landscape and the lives of the beings that live in it are tied to each other, each shaped by the other extensively – “through living in it, the landscape becomes a part of us, just as we are a part of it” (Ingold 1993, 154). Ingold gives the example of a mountain which “through the exercises of descending and climbing, and their different muscular entailments, the contours of the landscape are not so much measured as felt – they are directly incorporated into our bodily experience” (1993, 166).

This dwelling perspective aligns with the connection between ancestors and geography expressed as important by my contributors. The relationship between Māori and the land began with the creation story of Papatūānuku, Ranginui and other atua⁴¹ who are linked to past, present and future generations through whakapapa (Williams 2004, 50). In the beginning Rangi-nui and Papatūānuku clung to each other and their children lived in the darkness. Frustrated, the children decided to separate their parents, done by Tāne-mahuta. The separation led to distinction where the parents, and their descendants, became associated with aspects of the natural world (cited in Ka’ai et al. 2004, 5). These

---

³⁷ Treasure.

³⁸ Narrative, story.

³⁹ Sea.

⁴⁰ Vital essence.

⁴¹ Gods.

atua, and the ancestors that followed are woven into the landscape, and it is by living in the landscape that Māori people are connected to them. John Rangihau explains that the emotional tie Māori have to the land is a result of this Māori mythology which teaches Māori where they come from (Rangihau 1992, 228). Thus, Māori are not living in an empty environment, a blank space, but a landscape which holds history and ancestors.

Mana Whenua, Tūrangawaewae, and 'Imports'

The importance of whenua to being Rakaipaaka and the embodiment and expression of it as an ancestor was expressed clearly in all of my interviews and throughout my fieldwork. This is because Rakaipaaka ancestors and their stories are a part of the landscape, a prominent example being that of Moumoukai. In 'Temporality of the Landscape' Ingold describes a tree as a form which,

embodies the entire history of its development from the movement it took first root. And that history consists in the unfolding of its relations with manifold components of its environment, including the people who have nurtured it, tilled the soil around it, pruned its branches, picked its fruit, and – as at present – used it as something to lean against. The people, in other words, are as much bound up in the life of the tree as is the tree in the life of the people (Ingold 1993, 168).

For Rakaipaaka, Moumoukai acts in much the same way. As well as the story of its name regularly been recited to me, my Aunty Poipoi also told me another story that expressed this understanding of the life of Moumoukai being bound up in the lives of Rakaipaaka people and vice versa:

A whakataukī that I really love is 'O Moumoukai – kia purea e ngā hau o Tawhirimatea' which kind of translates to the winds of Tawhirimatea⁴² will blow through you and give you life. It's about returning to your whenua and your maunga to re-energise yourself. When Hickson and Kiri⁴³ were living in Wellington they would ring up and say they were feeling homesick or had no energy. They couldn't come back home every time they felt like this so I would tell them to go to Lyall Bay and put their hands and feet in the water because that water came from Moumoukai, travelled all the way down the Nuhaka River and that the water would give them energy again. They would call me back afterwards and tell me they felt much better - Dennise Raroa (pers comms, November 2015).

Here that intertwining of Moumoukai and Rakaipaaka people can be seen. The strength of the mountain and the tenacity of ancestors who lived upon it are considered a source of strength and energy from which present generations can draw on.

Another common way the idea of the whenua as ancestral is expressed is through the whakatauaki, 'Ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga'. The whakatauaki can be seen as an expression of the mana whenua of those who have strong connections with and roots in the area, an idea intimately intertwined with the ancestor Te Tahinga and his actions⁴⁴. The connection of the whakatauaki to mana whenua was expressed in a few words by Graeme,

---

⁴² God of the winds.

⁴³ Her children.

⁴⁴ Important to note is that there are varied meanings of this whakataukī.

‘Ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga’ means literally the hundred houses of Te Tahinga. He didn’t have a hundred houses but he was spread out, his mana, within Rakaipaaka. And he was out Mahia too, his children and his mokopuna had pā there . . . Might not be physically a hundred [houses] but it was all the mana whenua that was given to them from their tīpuna.

As well as being discussed in many of my interviews the whakatauaki was often used to end pēpeha as a way of outlining the speakers own mana whenua through their connection to Te Tahinga. The perspective that the landscape is intertwined with the lives lived in it, and the sense of mana whenua that comes with this, is a major influence in the sense of home and belonging many Rakaipaaka people feel when they are in Nuhaka. Tāmati, who resides outside the rohe, in Wellington, expressed this feeling in his interview:

I know that my stomping ground goes from Opoho to Waikokopu, to the Whareratas. And every time I go home, which is quite often, if I’m coming from Gisborne, if I’m going over the Whareratas, every time I see Moumoukai I feel a sense of peace. Ka mihi au ki te maunga, ki te koroua ra⁴⁵. Every time I come from Wairoa as soon as I pass Opoho stream I know I’m home, and I just feel this real sense of belonging, sense of ease, of being at ease.

Tūrangawaewae is an important concept to discuss here. It is a Māori concept which literally means “a standing place for feet” or “a place to stand” (Kidman 2012, 193) referring to a sense of belonging to, and connection with, the land “that is experienced when members of hapū communities have occupied a region for several generations” (Kidman 2012, 193). The concepts signalled by tūrangawaewae are common in Indigenous communities. Sissons argues that “indigeneity is not primarily an individual biological or cultural identity; it is a mode of belonging to places, communities and nations. It is also a type of connection between people who belong to these places, communities and nations in Indigenous ways” (2005, 58). For Māori this idea has become even more important with Treaty settlements where connections to the land have to be proven. However, it is not just legal motivations that inspire such distinct markers of identity, it is also ideas of authenticity which can be seen in the discussion of ‘imports’.

‘Imports’ stands in opposition to the understanding of mana whenua conveyed by ‘Ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga’. It suggests that it is very difficult for those who have no roots or strong connection in the area “to gain recognition or status or indeed to even understand the place. Without strong ties, the newly arrived and even some who have resided for years in the area, no matter their contributions to the community, are often dismissed as ‘imports’” (Nuhaka School Foreword, N.D). This was also expressed in a story told to me by Liz:

That’s something Pauline was saying to me just the other day. Somebody was asking ‘oh who went down to the AIP signing?’ and they said ‘Hana and Val. Well you see Hana’s from Iwitea, and Val’s from Chatham Islands and this other lady made a remark like ‘oh, they’re all imports to Nuhaka’. Then Pauline said ‘yea but their mokopuna belong to Rakaipaaka’ and that shut them up . . . This is what the older generation is doing to itself, you know. Auntie Tao she only started to do karanga just a month or two ago and then when Uncle Grae died she was helping Levia and Adelaide, they were the three doing most of the karanga during his tangi. Then Pauline was saying she gets a remark like ‘oh yea but she’s an import’. This import business is just so, so... you know I wouldn’t of blamed Tao if she had just said ‘oh blow you fullas I’m not doing karanga for you fullas anymore’ but she stuck

---

⁴⁵ Here, Tāmati is paying homage to his ancestral mountain, Moumoukai.

her toes in and she said ‘yea I’m not from here but my mokopuna are all from here and this is there tūrangawaewae and their Nanny can stand on it’ and I thought ‘good girl’.

Because the concept of tūrangawaewae is so important to the Rakaipaaka community a perceived lack of connection with land can delegitimise claims of Rakaipaakatanga, promoting an apparently distinct binary of who and who is not part of the community. Such a distinct binary is not usually apparent and as Liz pointed out it seems to be a line of thought held mostly by a few of the older generation. However, there was articulated a distinction between iwi ahi kā - those living at within the rohe, and iwi taura here – those resident elsewhere (Carter 2011), a distinction which often connected authenticity with a visible investment in home. This is of particular importance because of the massive urban migration of Māori. The 2013 census records that 65.6 percent of the total population of Māori descent live in main urban centres⁴⁶. For Rakaipaaka this statistic sits at 64.7 percent with the most common regions of residence in Hawke’s Bay, Auckland and Wellington (Statistics NZ 2013, 3).

Urbanisation

The idea that it is by living in the landscapes which hold ancestors and their stories that Māori connect to them could be considered problematic because of this mass urban migration which has meant many Māori do not live within their traditional rohe boundaries. As Tahu Kukutai points out many studies of urban Māori, and Indigenous urbanisation more broadly have, in the past, viewed urban Māori as less culturally authentic than those that live in ‘traditional’ non-urban areas (2013, 325). Peters and Andersen make reference to Terry Goldie’s work (1989) which found that Indigenous cultures were only presented as authentic in the white literature of Canada, Australia, and Aotearoa New Zealand when they were shown in “isolated areas, far from the metropolitan centres of society” (Peters and Andersen 2013, 5). González argues that problems arise when Māori are forced to exercise their Māori identity as a “*permanent essentialism*” something promoted when a non-urban location is considered as integral to an authentic cultural identity. She goes on to say that this “at the very least dehistoricises and naturalises the Māori subject, and at worst, leads to the exclusion of those who do not display ‘authentic’ Māori behaviour and traits” (2010, 29). A de-authenticating of Rakaipaakatanga because of urbanization was expressed by Tāmāti when he was discussing his involvement with Treaty claim work: “I’m not gonna say it was easy, because it wasn’t, it wasn’t easy. Not just the physical stuff, but the acceptance from the home people. Because there’s this other school of thought . . . and it’s a dangerous school of thought from my perspective, that you’re a bit less Rakaipaaka if you’re not living there” (Tāmāti).

Urbanisation has been a major factor in the call for a reconsideration of identity formation processes, with Peters and Anderson (2013), as well as many other academics, arguing that the urban migration of Indigenous peoples has made it increasingly difficult for cultural identities to be bound to certain places. González addresses this difficulty by arguing that “although Indigenous projects may be essentially place-making they are not completely place-bound” (2010, 75) referring to both the importance of land and place to iwi identity but also the experience of movement, especially through urbanisation. John, in his interview, discussed some of the issues faced by iwi taura here, which he came to recognise through his own urban migration:

I don’t mean this in an arrogant sense but I don’t feel I’ve ever had an identity crisis . . . I didn’t realise that I had the luxury of growing up where I’m from traditionally. This isn’t

---

⁴⁶ Main urban centres are defined as having a population of 30,000 or more (Statistics NZ 2013, 2).

always the case and when I came to Wellington I met a number of people who hadn't. It's not until you get in that situation that you realise what you take for granted. So I took for granted the community I came from, the connections I had, the pride I had coming from there. It wasn't even something you thought about, it was what it was. For me when I first came here and got involved with our Kahungunu taura here (urban kinship group) we used to run whakapapa wānanga, waiata wānanga, all those kinds of things. That's when I realised that what I grew up with as a normal understanding and sense of who I was in terms of my identity was not always the case for many of my relations, who had just as much right as anyone else to say they were from home but weren't surrounded by some of the knowledge and understanding I was. And you know, I think those are the kinds of things you take for granted until you are away from it – John.

The koru framework can be a valuable tool for this discussion. As González suggests, referring to her work with the Kahungunu diaspora in Wellington, the “diversity of Māori lives means that they are not culturally or physically bound to one particular place *per se*. Kahungunu are ‘unfinished’ and continuously ‘becoming’ in many kinds of spaces and places” (2010, 74). It is important to make clear that Indigenous peoples do not lose their cultural history and traditions through migration. Instead, the values and behaviours associated with tribal origins are reproduced in new locations. As Peters and Anderson demonstrate, “Indigeneity survives, adapts, and innovates in modern cities” (2013, 2). Similarly, Durie states that for Māori, “fifty years of urbanization [has] demonstrated that it has been possible to live side by side with other New Zealanders without being assimilated into a homogenous way of life. It has been possible to retain links with whānau and hapū” (2005, 24).

Iwi ahi kā and Iwi taura here

It is possible that tension between iwi ahi kā and iwi taura here helps to maintain this delegitimisation but the responsibility does not lie with one group to find a solution. For instance, it is not only up to the iwi ahi kā to just accept those living away from home as Rakaipaaka. Instead, iwi taura here must demonstrate a desire and willingness to share in the challenges and responsibilities too often placed on iwi ahi kā alone. As Graeme suggested in his interview,

Nowadays there's not a lot of old people, what they call kaumātua, over 60-65 or something. Only my brother-in-law [and] physically he's not that well to stay at a marae. But yea I do [powhiri] all the time, quite a big mahi⁴⁷. We've had about 17-18 [tangihanga this year]. They were all sick though but yea a lot of people, I hope there's no more. It's a big mahi in the sense [you have to] take time off work. Other people might be on a salary or only working with the boss but some employers would be hōhā⁴⁸ at you taking that much time off work. It's quite a bit of work, quite a bit of time taken off. . . And the physical thing, it's quite tiring. Some people they might come back for one night or something and then that's their time and then they go. But like us ahi kā, we're here all the time for everything and this year's been sort of non-stop and it's quite full on. That's about all I do, go to work, go to church, go to marae, [and] go to the mokos⁴⁹.

---

⁴⁷ Work.

⁴⁸ Annoyed.

⁴⁹ Grandchildren.

With this understanding tūrangawaewae can be considered as a sense of belonging that emerges through both ancestral attachment to the land but also practices that engage people with the land today. Kidman suggests that through mass urbanisation the “notion of a territorialized *sense* of belonging has been separated from a territorialized *politics* of belonging” (2012, 191). In other words, tūrangawaewae and the “familiarity, place-attachment, and emotional investment” attached to the concept do not only have to come from living in the landscape, they can also come from everyday activities that engage people with the land (Kidman 2012, 191).

Whakapapa

What does Rakaipaakatanga mean for me? It adequately reflects who I really am, my whakapapa. That's what the essence of it is for me, it is who I am, it is my whakapapa – Tāmāti.

Whakapapa has been described as “a philosophy of the universe and all that exists within it” (unknown cited in Aikman-Dodd 2014, 214); a “vibrant kete⁵⁰ weaved with the harakeke⁵¹ of different iwi, ethnicities, [and] religions” (Gera 2014), and; a genealogical table that connects “people, animals, mountains, lakes and rivers – the environment” (Roberts 2006, 4). The literal meaning of whakapapa is “to lie flat, to place layers one upon another” (Roberts 2006, 4). However, the meaning of whakapapa is often reduced to a genealogy which describes connections between only people (Ka'ai and Higgins 2004, 13); a list of names sometimes in the form of a kinship diagram. Jeff Sissons argues that this latter conception of whakapapa is motivated by a Euro-centric worldview which “divorce[s] the humanity from the materiality of kinship ... [reinforcing] an understanding of kinship as ultimately transcendent” (2013, 1). Ingold argues that kinship diagrams driven by this understanding can immobilize ancestors “on one spot, their entire life compressed into a single position within the genealogical grid, from which there is no escape” (2007, 113). In contrast, Jude Roberts explains that for Māori “everything in the universe has a whakapapa (genealogy); people, animals, mountains, lakes and rivers - the environment. Everything and everybody has a genealogical link that inter-connects and inter-relates to each other” (2006, 4). Similarly, Pikihiua Reihana argues that “for Māori, whakapapa contextualises who they are by positioning themselves within the context of people and communities that include whānau, hapū and iwi; and their relationship with the landscape and the environment” (Reihana 2014, 10).

Whakapapa as a ‘meshwork’

With this understanding whakapapa has many similarities to what Ingold calls a ‘meshwork’. The meshwork is described by Ingold as the “entangled lines of life, growth and movement” that make up the world (2011, 63). Accordingly, the notion of life as originating from a world that already exists is put aside and instead life is seen as inseparable from the process of the world’s continual generation or “coming-into-being” (Ingold 2011, 67). Ingold explains that “what is commonly known as the ‘web of life’ is precisely that: not a network of connected points, but a meshwork of interwoven lines” (2011,

---

⁵⁰ Basket (usually woven with flax).

⁵¹ Flax.

63). This interweaving meshwork is made up of lines that signal a flow of substances of many different kinds which when woven together make up organisms (human or animal). Thus, Ingold suggests, organisms should not be considered “as a bounded entity surrounded by an environment but as an unbounded entanglement of lines in fluid space” (2011, 64). Ingold references a man from the Wemindji Cree of northern Canada who describes life as “continuous birth” (Scott 1989 cited in Ingold 2011, 65). Similarly, if we return to Jackson’s understanding of life as embodying the past and present we can consider whakapapa as a meshwork of sorts. As mentioned, Jackson outlines that “each new event, each generation of ideas and actions that shape human lives is a product of those that have gone before. Nothing exists in isolation or arises spontaneously . . . Instead, the present and future are only the past revisited” (2007, 173). This acts as a reminder that whakapapa is not just a genealogical kinship diagram listing ancestor’s names but that is more than this. It is a meshwork of interweaving lines, lines of ancestor’s lives, histories, and associated geographies, which help make up the meshwork of life today.

Important for this thesis is that for Māori, whakapapa and the relational ties prompted by it (whanaungatanga) are a central feature of identity (Moeke-Pickering 1996). In agreement with this, whakapapa was articulated as being one of the most important markers of Rakaipaakatanga for my contributors. For example, when I asked Tāmati what being Rakaipaaka meant to him, he responded, “It adequately reflects who I really am, my whakapapa. That’s what the essence of it is for me, it is who I am, it is my whakapapa”. Although it was not stated explicitly, Rakaipaaka understandings of whakapapa seemed to embody similar characteristics to the meshwork. For instance, in his interview John stated,

The interesting thing is that in our philosophies your learning starts from the point of conception not birth. From the point of your conception you are learning until the day you die. So I would absolutely agree that you are refining your understanding, you are building your understanding, you get more comfortable with your understanding of who you are as Rakaipaaka over time, and I don’t think you’re ever quite finished with that. Just in the same way that you’re never quite finished understanding how you connect with other people, those are always things you can add to . . . it’s not ending.

The coming-into-being nature of it was also demonstrated when my contributors spoke of their experiences learning their whakapapa.

I’ve learnt about my whakapapa from Kōhanga, School, College, and Te Ataarangi⁵², all since I’ve grown up. I’ve been getting information from people, like my Nan; from going down to the wānanga held at the marae where you have to learn your whakapapa. You have to take it to the marae, and then everyone gives you everyone else’s showing how you’re connected – Esta.

I never came to live in Nuhaka until I was 17. . . I wasn’t really bothered much by [learning whakapapa] eh, it took a while. Then it starts growing, starts coming to you. So Uncle Bub and my wife would have being brought up on the marae but we weren’t like that, and I used to feel whakamā⁵³. But then at the same time I was a bit like you, interested in history and all that sort of stuff. I used to follow a lot of things, read a lot, always listened to the father-in-law, kōrero and follow whakapapa stuff – Graeme.

---

⁵² Te reo Māori course.

⁵³ Embarrassed, shy.

I like whakapapa, it's the kind of stuff I never get enough time to look at. I kind of like whakapapa because you can take a sheet of whakapapa and look at it one week and two weeks later you'll see something different – John.

Such sentiments express the idea that Rakaipaakatanga is constantly coming-into-being. Rakaipaakatanga does not originate from an identity that already exists. Rather, it is inseparable from the process of living in a world that is constantly becoming.

Understandings of whakapapa as static kinship diagrams maintains the static and rigid identity frameworks which often influence understandings of Māori identity. This misinterpretation of whakapapa not only fails to recognise the diversity inherent in Rakaipaakatanga, it also fails to reflect Rakaipaaka understandings of the role whakapapa plays in Rakaipaakatanga. For instance, those I interviewed expressed how whakapapa connects people to stories and whenua, as well as each other. Such an understanding was clearly visible in John's interview, where, when I asked him how his understandings of being Rakaipaaka had changed over the years, he shared,

I would like to think now I have a deeper understanding of my Rakaipaaka whakapapa ... and also a deeper understanding of those cultural icons of ours. When I was growing up, it was sufficient for me to know that Moumoukai was my maunga, now I know some of the history of the place. Now I know how Rakaipaaka settled there when he came from Gisborne. Now I understand more deeply how it got its current name, which goes back to the 1820s when Ngā Puhi put it under siege. So I didn't have all of those, that's what I kind of mean by my cultural awareness and understanding and identity becoming more refined. It has more depth and body to it now . . . [I have] a better understanding of Rakaipaaka and the hapū and the connection to the marae, the major family lines, our connections with Te Mahia, Turanga, Wairoa, and further South through Te Huki⁵⁴ down to Heretaunga and indeed Ngāti Kahungunu whānui⁵⁵. I have a richer understanding now of our Rakaipaaka and Kahungunu connections to other iwi and to waka.

Recognising that whenua and stories are also an important part of whakapapa challenges the 'kinship diagram' understanding that helps maintain static and rigid identity frameworks.

Whanaungatanga

An important part of establishing and maintaining the connections made through whakapapa is the concept of whanaungatanga. As Acushla O'Carroll explains "whakapapa links [are] fostered and lived through shared whanaungatanga experiences" (2013, 232). As discussed in Chapter Two, whanaungatanga is a holistic concept. It describes kinship relations, a sense of family connection and belonging, and the establishing and maintaining of these relationships (Ka'ai and Higgins 2004). Definitions of whanaungatanga are a plenty; William McNatty's review included: "the concept of interrelationships" (Barrett-Aranui 1999 cited in McNatty 2001); the "basic cement that holds things Māori together" (Richie 1992 cited in McNatty 2001), and; "whānau, [as] 'family or body of close kin, whether linked by blood, adoption or fostering'; ngā as a generalised extension of whānau; and tanga as an indication of 'a process concept concerned with everything about relationships between kin'"

---

⁵⁴ The story of Te Huki is presented in Chapter 5: Post-Settlement Futures – Making and Binding Connections.

⁵⁵ Broadly.

(Richie 1992 cited in McNatty 2001). Rangihau suggests whanaungatanga means “that whenever a person feels lonely he will go round and visit some of his kin and it is just as enjoyable for the kin to receive a visit as it is for the person to go” (1992, 222). However, it is important to note that like most Māori concepts a strict and all-encompassing definition, especially one that involves translation, is not truly possible, nor desirable. As Tānia Ka'ai and Rawinia Higgins explain, Māori concepts, including whanaungatanga “are interconnected . . . [which] has often made defining individual customary concepts extremely difficult, as each concept is defined by its relationship with other concepts and not in isolation” (Ka'ai and Higgins 2004, 13). Whanaungatanga is intimately intertwined with manaakitanga, kotahitanga⁵⁶, mana whenua and many other Māori concepts. It focuses on relationships and highlights the inter-relatedness of all things.

Belonging and Rakaipaakatanga

Part of the importance of whakapapa, and consequently whanaungatanga, lies in the sense of belonging that whakapapa connections can create. In turn, this sense of belonging is an important element in helping Rakaipaaka people to feel confident and comfortable in their Rakaipaakatanga. This was made most clear when I was told the following story by Liz:

Uncle Cambridge (a tohunga whakairo⁵⁷) died before we opened Tāne Marae. I'm thinking 'what's gonna happen? Who am I supposed to send the invites to when the whare has been opened?' All of these things which he would've just been there to say to me. So what I tried to do was remember who the tipuna were who he had put into our house. That was the only clue that I had, the connections.

That whare is your connection to everybody, it's almost like every tribe in New Zealand is in our whare. It's so different to Kahungunu Marae. In Kahungunu they go way up, across the top, rangatira to rangatira. Our whare starts from us, how we're connected into Tolaga Bay. You know, we've got Rongomaiwahine with Tamatakutai in our whare. You know the whare, our whare, is a real whakapapa book, it actually is. After the opening, we got Paora Whaanga to run a couple of wānanga with us to give us an idea of who those tipuna were so we knew why Uncle Cambridge chose them and why they were there.

Now, I know Nanny Tangi always thought she was an outsider because she wasn't from here. No one ever said to her 'oh you don't belong', but Aunty was brought up in Tolaga Bay. But of course, as you go down by the mattress room door the last one before you go in the door was Hauiti who was Aunty Tangi's tribe in Tolaga Bay.

And their connection to us is through Kahungunu's sister, Ira, who was Hauiti's mother. Paora said to us 'right you choose one tipuna each and you go away and research them' and of course she went to research her tipuna, Hauiti. And ever after that Aunty was just over the moon to think that her tipuna Hauiti is in the whare. So you can see how important it is to see and feel that connection, because if you know where you fit into the scheme of things, oh my gosh, wow, you feel really good.

---

⁵⁶ Principles associated with unity.

⁵⁷ Master Carver.

So connections - we need to know our past, our past is so important because of our connections. And if you know who you are, how you fit into the scheme of things, it makes you feel so much stronger, it makes you feel whole. You get this feeling inside of you that's just so at home. You go somewhere and you hear them doing the whakapapa, you hear them welcoming you, and you sit there going 'ah he's talking to me, he's talking to me' which is, for me, something that is so important for all learners to have, this feeling of belonging, this is where I belong, I belong here – Liz.

Most of my other contributors also expressed this feeling of belonging prompted by whakapapa and learning whakapapa connections. For instance, Graeme in his interview said,

When I started learning about a lot of my whakapapa, it makes you feel really good about it, you're not frightened to go somewhere or you're not frightened because you know you got a connection or whatever eh, makes a big difference.

In another instance, John expressed,

I like knowing how I connect with others and I also like the reception you get when you use things like whakapapa in your whaikōrero to connect to people, it's a nice feeling to know that you can articulate how you connect to another iwi or waka and also its very nice to be the recipient of the warm response from them, even if you have to go back 20 generations to make the connection.

The influence of this sense of belonging and security on Māori identity has been explored by many academics. Michael King (1992) suggests that "people with security of identity in one culture are more easily able to integrate with another" (King 1992, 15). Likewise, Rangihau argues that "young folk can live with a greater amount of assurance if they know who they are . . . They can move into the Pākehā world full of self-confidence because they have no difficulty about the question of identity. They recognise themselves fully because they know their history" (Rangihau 1992, 224).

The desire for Rakaipaaka people, particularly in regards to rangatahi⁵⁸, to feel comfortable and confident in their cultural identity, was an aspiration expressed by my contributors across the board. In other words, they wanted Rakaipaaka people to feel a sense of belonging to the community, a sense of security in terms of knowing who they are and where they fit in the place of the world. Throughout the interviews many of them expressed that one way of fulfilling this aspiration was the making and binding of connections with others. Graeme spoke of the importance of knowing your connections to others in his interview,

You wanna know your koroua and tīpuna but you wanna know who his brothers and sisters are eh. Because bad people, oh not many, but people will say you don't belong and this sort of stuff. But they don't know, the ones that say that are the ones that don't know. That happened to me years ago here, then I started learning from Papa Paora.

Likewise, Liz in her interview, asserted the importance of learning and binding your connections, telling me the story of Rangiahua pā to make her point.

On the way out of Wairoa you go towards Waikaremoana, you come to Rangiahua, well that's the name of the place. They took the name from here and put it on their pā. Now why would they do that? Because they are descendants of Hinemanuhiri who was Rakaipaaka's sister. And you know putting that kōrero out for our whānau it makes so much

---

⁵⁸ Young people.

difference as to how we feel. Because I think those ones up there thought they were another tribe again, and I used to say to them ‘if only you knew how closely related we are. I know when they had the Mongrel Mob and the Black Power fighting [we said] to them ‘hey, they’re your relations; you’re Rakaipaaka and they’re Hinemanuhiri’ and we had a big hui⁵⁹ at Rangiahua pā trying to get it across to them that they’re not Wairoa people, they’re our people too, they belong. And . . . I was sitting on their veranda of their meeting house and I said to Charlie where did you get your name Rangiahua from and he looked at me and said ‘from you’. I said ‘you mean our Rangiahua? Our pā?’ He said ‘when that pā was closed they took the name’. If there was a tangi in Nuhaka they would come, if there was a tangi in Rangiahua Nuhaka would all go. I said to him ‘I think maybe we need to bring this back, don’t you think?’, and he said ‘oh well the young ones don’t know’, and I said ‘well then we need to make sure they do know’.

Her story is a reminder of a point already acknowledged by Tāmāti of the internalisation of distinct and rigid iwi structures which promote the idea of distinct iwi communities. It is a learning and re-binding of the connections between iwi, something which will blur seemingly distinct boundaries, which Liz articulated as being the key to a positive future for Rakaipaaka. On this she stated,

We’ve got the connection but we’re not binding . . . That is what the present must be doing. We need to do the binding. We know the connections to the past and present, it’s [the] binding, you know, how do we do that?”

Te Reo Māori

Ko Te Reo te mauri o te mana Māori
Language is the cornerstone of what it is to be Māori
- Sir James Henare, 1985

Arapera Ngaha proposes that “language is more than the words that are communicated from one to another. Language helps to present our identity in diverse ways: through our relationships with others, through the engagement in and with our culture, and through the way we use language in our day-to-day interactions” (2014, 71). Te reo Māori is considered by most to be an essential part of Māori identity and was expressed as such by my contributors. In accordance with this, here I consider the importance of te reo Māori to Rakaipaakatanga. First, I briefly explore the interaction between language and identity, and consequently education in both Māori, and Rakaipaaka history. Then, I will explore how Rakaipaakatanga is expressed through te reo Māori, focusing on code-switching and whakataukī, and also how it can be expressed through te reo Pākehā⁶⁰.

Language, Identity, and Education

In his interview, Tāmāti exclaimed, “it’s like any other iwi or hapū, te reo Māori has to be at the heart of [Rakaipaaka]. Te reo Māori along with our tikanga and kawa, our protocols and our customs, actually

---

⁵⁹ Meeting.

⁶⁰ English language.

define our culture, who we are. That is our point of difference. So te reo Māori has to figure in our future, and if it doesn't I would assert that we are not Rakaipaaka, in fact we are not even Māori, we're just something else". Tāmāti's thoughts regarding te reo Māori and its role in Rakaipaakatanga align with an essentialist theoretical position on the relationship between language and identity, supported in Māori literature (Durie 1997; Fishman 1999; Ngaha 2005 cited in Ngaha 2014, 72). The essentialist tradition suggests that "identity and language are inextricably linked" and that therefore te reo Māori is an integral part of Māori identity (Ngaha 2014, 72).

The suggestion that those that identify as Māori ought to speak te reo Māori can be problematic, as only 21.3 percent of the total Māori population can speak about everyday things in te reo Māori (Statistics 2013, 7), a result of Aotearoa New Zealand's colonial history. As Ranginui Walker explains, underpinning colonisation are "assumptions of cultural superiority" which allowed colonisers to justify their 'civilising' mission" in Aotearoa New Zealand (Walker 1990, 146). As well as acting as a justification, assumptions of cultural superiority meant colonisation did not only involve physical invasion of land and bodies but also the "cultural invasion and colonisation of the mind" (Walker 1990, 146). Similarly, Jackson argues that "the idea that power comes from the barrel of a gun has been a handy colonising truism", noting that as well as explicit physical violence, power can also be "exercised in less overtly violent ways, through attacks on the souls and minds of people to be dispossessed" (2007, 187). He states, that "destroying the world-view and culture of indigenous peoples has always been as important as taking their lives, because the actual process of disempowerment, the key purpose of any colonisation, has to function at the spiritual and psychic level as well as the physical and political" (2007, 178). Walker suggests that, "to this end, the missionaries, and later the state, used education as an instrument of cultural invasion" (1990, 146). Particularly important here, is that it was the silencing of te reo Māori in the education system which acted as a major factor in the decline of te reo Māori speakers in Aotearoa New Zealand (Kawharu 2014, 2).

Initially the first schools⁶¹ set up in Aotearoa New Zealand taught in te reo Māori. However, in 1847 the Education Ordinance, instigated by Governor George Grey, insisted that instruction in schools be conducted in English (Barrington 1970, 28). Progress was slow in Native Schools, an obvious result of the foreign nature of the western education system. However, the government blamed poor English, which led to instruction from the Inspector of Native Affairs in 1905, to teachers, to "speak only English in school playgrounds" (Walker 1990, 147). Walker explains that "this instruction was translated into a general prohibition of the Māori language within school precincts, [and for] the next five decades the prohibition was in some instances enforced by corporal punishment" (1990, 147). Hana, in her interview, spoke of the history of education in Nuhaka, also noting the silencing of te reo Māori in school.

Early 19th century, it was decided by government to establish a Native School in Nuhaka. After some haggling, a five acre site was gifted by Māori and construction commenced in September, 1898. Because of language barriers and other differences, it was thought necessary to have separate schools for Māori and for Europeans. School opened on December 12, 1898 with a roll of forty-five children, which by closure for summer had increased by five . . . From 1908 to 1911 the roll was over 100 pupils and the Department of Education felt that Nuhaka would become one of the largest Māori schools in New Zealand.

[By] 1961, [the] roll had risen steadily to 253 and the Minister of Education approved the amalgamation of the Māori School with the [European] School . . . This amalgamation was welcomed as it was felt that it would have a lasting effect in bringing together the Māori

---

⁶¹ Mission schools.

and Europeans of the Nuhaka district. In 1962, the Morere Public School and Nuhaka Public School [were also] amalgamated with a roll of 288. Your mum⁶² would have attended school during this time and your Nanny in the years before her. Both would've have been strapped if they spoke Māori.

Walker states, that “the damaging aspect of [the practice of corporeal punishment] lay not in corporal punishment *per se*, but in the psychological effect on an individual’s sense of identity and personal worth. Schooling demanded cultural surrender, or at the very least suppression of one’s language and identity” (1990, 147).

By the 1970s, te reo Māori ability and usage in Aotearoa New Zealand, had declined “to the point where it was thought it would die out unless something was done to save it” (Walker 1990, 147-8). Only 15 percent of those under fifteen years old could speak Māori even though they made up 50 percent of the total population, whereas 38 percent of te reo Māori speakers were over the age of forty-five but only made up 12 per cent of the Māori population (Walker 1990, 238). At the 1981 Hui Whakatauirā, Māori kaumātua accepted the challenge to save te reo Māori. They proposed “the concept of kōhanga reo, run by kuia, koro, and mature women who were native speakers of Māori” (Walker 1990, 238). Hana, also spoke of the establishment of Kōhanga Reo in Nuhaka and the establishment of full-immersion te reo Māori classes at Nuhaka School which followed.

In 1982, Kōhanga Reo was established in New Zealand, and in 1988, Rakaipaaka opened up their Kōhanga at Te Rehu Marae, [committing] themselves to the Kōhanga and Te Reo revitalisation movement. In 1990, the parents of the children that had attended Kōhanga in 1988 were concerned that they would lose their Māori language when they began attending mainstream public school. So they held meetings and organised for a total immersion class to be set up at Nuhaka School. In 1990, the Whanau Class, also known as full immersion, was established with ten children, some who were withdrawn from the mainstream classes and put into the te reo class so that it had ten children which was the minimum required. This was the first total immersion class in the Wairoa district.

In Aotearoa New Zealand, the latest research illustrates that the health of te reo Māori is not strong (Ngaha 2014, 73). As mentioned, the census shows that only around 21.3 percent of Māori can hold a conversation about everyday things in te reo Māori. For the Rakaipaaka community the numbers are slightly better, with 34 percent able to speak basic te reo Māori. However, this is down from 2006 when the figure was 35.8 percent (Statistics 2013, 7). The argument that te reo Māori is fundamental to Māori identity also suggests that if one is under threat so is the other. Consequently, such figures do not only signal language under threat but also the “distinctiveness of . . . Māori identity” (Gee, Stephens, Higgins and Liu, 2003 cited in Ngaha 2014, 73). Merata Kawharu explains that “Māori kin-group communities, and New Zealand as a whole, are at a new cultural crossroads” (2014, 2). She asserts that “we need to better understand what [those crossroads are] if we are to respond properly to the challenges of maintaining and enhancing our indigenous identity; an identity that marks New Zealand out from the rest of the world” (2014, 2). Rakaipaaka are at this crossroads, with all my contributors emphasising the vital role te reo Māori has in Rakaipaakatanga, and more broadly Māoritanga, whilst at the same time acknowledging that certain changes may need to be made regarding the use of te reo Māori.

---

⁶² Addressing me in the interview.

Code-mixing

Code-mixing (also known as code-switching) refers to the mixing of languages in dialogue (Ngaha 2014, 85). Here I focus on the switch between te reo Māori and English in the Rakaipaaka community. For example, the use of phrases such as ‘Kia ora’, ‘Ka pai’ and ‘Haere mai’ which are regularly inserted into English conversation. Code-mixing was used by my contributors throughout their interviews, and was also a prominent feature of my stay in Nuhaka. Some examples that came up during the interviews include:

“I get a lot of flak from my mentors who say that it’s *whakahīhi*⁶³” – Tāmati.

“That’s my *whakaaro*⁶⁴” – Graeme.

“I don’t care if people get *hōhā*⁶⁵ with them” – Avon.

“I thought our *kuia* and our *whāea*⁶⁶ were really the glue that stuck our community together” – John.

Ngaha suggests that code-mixing might “be viewed as a political statement that reaffirms and aligns the individual with their community [and] their identity as Māori” (2014, 86). This was evident in Irene’s interview. When I asked her what she thought the role of te reo Māori was in Rakaipaakatanga, she responded, “I don’t have the reo, I have tried many times”, explaining to me later that she still recognised its importance in Rakaipaaka’s future. However, her lack of fluency did not stop her from asserting a Māori identity by using code-mixing throughout her interview. For example,

“I enjoyed following the Treaty claims *mahi*.”

“*Manaakitanga*, eh. That *tautoko awhi*⁶⁷, just make the people feel comfortable, welcome, and at home.”

“Your *wairua* has a lot to do with making people feel comfortable. It’s an open door policy . . . where you can come in and out, you know ‘*nau mai, haere mai*’⁶⁸.”

“He’s like an old soul in a young boy’s body, he’s one of those *taonga*.”

Such code-mixing is common in many parts of New Zealand, with John Macalister arguing that it is this inclusion of te reo Māori and English code-mixing which makes New Zealand English unique (2005). Additionally, in terms of identity, code-mixing can offer individuals, like Irene, the opportunity to assert a Māori identity even when they are not fluent in te reo Māori. This is important for the majority of those that are a part of the Rakaipaaka community that cannot speak te reo Māori well. It allows them to assert, like Irene, their Māoritanga, which in turn helps towards nurturing that feeling of belonging, which was expressed as important by my contributors.

Similarly, some Māori words that are used in code-mixing refer to concepts that are more likely to be understood by those who are a part of a Māori world (Ngaha 2014, 86). The use of these words “suggests an understanding of the value placed on important rituals or customary practices . . . It signals

---

⁶³ Arrogant.

⁶⁴ Opinion.

⁶⁵ Annoyed, fed up.

⁶⁶ Nannies and Aunties.

⁶⁷ Supportive embrace.

⁶⁸ Welcome, come here.

knowledge and understanding from within the culture, within the Māori world” (Ngaha 2014, 85). One may come to the conclusion that, “an English translation [is not felt to] give an adequate interpretation” (Ngaha 2014, 86). This form of code-mixing was also a prominent feature in my contributor’s responses. For example,

“You had these *tīpuna* who all had *mana* in their own right” – Tāmati.

“We all knew our *whanaunga*, our *whakapapa* links” – Tāmati.

“It was a real *waiata tangi*. *Tangi* for the land, *tangi* for what we’d lost” – Liz⁶⁹.

Furthermore, when translating from Māori to English there is often room for misinterpretation particularly with certain words which refer to concepts rather than distinct entities. As Ngaha points out code-mixing can help reduce the room for error and offence when using these words (2014, 86).

To consider code-mixing as an expression of Māori identity is not to deny the importance of te reo Māori for Māori people and identity. Instead code mixing acts as a way for those who, because of structural forces or personal choice speak English, to express Māori- and iwi-tanga. It also allows for the use of te reo to be more inclusive in terms of non-fluent speakers being able to use it. This linked in with an aspiration, voiced to me by my contributors, for te reo Māori to be more accessible and inclusive.

Using te reo Pākehā to assert Māoritanga

It has been argued by Ngaha, that “expressions of identity do not rely solely on the use of Indigenous language” (2014, 83). Ngaha makes reference to studies by Belinda Borrell (2005) and Adreanne Ormond (2004) which have demonstrated that “Māori youth have different priorities, in terms of identity, to those of their parents and grandparents and may express themselves as Māori in ways that do not always include use of te reo” (Ngaha, 2011, 16). For example, both studies suggested localised markers of identity were more important than pan-Māori markers, such as te reo Māori. Terms such as “‘Rewa hard’ and ‘South Side’ which are descriptors of the suburbs of Manurewa and the South Auckland region respectively” were used throughout Borell’s study (2005, 66). During my fieldwork, it became clear early on that expression of Rakaipaakatanga did not rely solely on the use of te reo Māori either. Rather, as Ngaha explains, articulations and expressions of identity “are sometimes seen is the choice of language used . . . [which] can make strong links with Māori identity, even when the language spoken is English” (Ngaha 2014, 83). Such a sentiment was clearly exemplified in the interviews I conducted with Hickson and Esta, my two youngest contributors, both in their early twenties

“Nuhaka first. And last” – Hickson.

“So my Nan’s from Whakaki but she says she’s Nuhaka hard” – Esta.

“Nuhaka, my life, my love, my home” – Esta.

The use of such expressions are a way of asserting Rakaipaakatanga without the use of te reo Māori. Again, it is important to note, that these expressions do not deny that te reo Māori is vital to Rakaipaakatanga, and Māoritanga more broadly. Rather, they are a contemporary and inclusive way (in

---

⁶⁹ In accordance with the points being made in regards to the use of these terms, they are not translated here. They are however, listed in the bibliography.

terms of non-Māori speaking Māori being able to access them reasonably easily) of expressing iwi identity, which can exist alongside expressions of Rakaipaakatanga in te reo Māori.

Whakataukī

The use of whakataukī by my contributors was a prominent feature of the interviews I conducted, and of my fieldwork overall, in particular ‘ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga’. Cowell suggests, that “the part whakataukī play within the Māori language and culture is an important one” (2013, 20). Their intergenerational existence, and the valuable wisdom they offer, makes them embodiments of ancestors (Cowell 2013, 20). Furthermore, the content and its meanings are usually succinct (Kōrero Māori, N.D). This view was supported by Sir Apirana Ngata who wrote that “in former times a wealth of meaning was clothed within a word or two as delectable as a proverb in its poetical form and in its musical sound” (cited in Cowell 2013, 20). As already discussed, ‘ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga’ is a special whakataukī for the Rakaipaaka community. The whakataukī has several meanings associated with it, and in his interview, Tāmāti spoke of the various meanings ‘ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga’ had for him.

The beauty of our whakataukī is that they have many meanings behind them. ‘Ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga o te ra’ – ‘the hundred house of Te Tahinga o te ra’. To me, that talks about a strong whakapapa, chiefly lines, the fact that Rakaipaaka was not an ahi⁷⁰, it was many ahi. And you think about that in terms of the Whareratas and all around that area, it talks about mana whenua – that the mana whenua of Rakaipaaka is entrenched. And you can see that in the many fires that are lit throughout the valleys, up on hills, and down by the coast.

Another interpretation of that is that ‘ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga o te ra’ actually speaks to lots of chiefs, no Indians, always fighting eh [laughs]. That’s where another saying comes from, ‘Ngāti Rangi mau toki’ - ‘Ngāti Rangi⁷¹ holders of the toki⁷²’. And some will say ‘oh that’s because they were good fighters’. Others would say ‘you never turn your back on the Ngāti Rangi, they’ll put the axe in it’ [laughs].

So it can have varied meanings. It’s how and when you use them that tells you what you want to drive them to. But I tend to think it’s more of the first one, ‘ngā whare rau’, talks about our chiefly lines. It’s like the saying in Te Arawa, ‘He tini whetu ki te Rangi, ki te Arawa ki te whenua’ - ‘there’s a myriad of stars in the sky, so there are Te Arawa on the Earth’. Heaps of Te Arawa people, that what that’s whakataukī is saying, heaps of Rakaipaaka people is what ours is saying. We ain’t weak cuz, we strong, that’s what it’s really saying.

Mead and Grove suggest that “for the modern Māori [whakataukī] are not merely historical relics. Rather they constitute a communication with the ancestors. Through the medium of words it is possible to discover how they thought about life and its problems. Their advice is as valuable today as before. Their use of metaphor and their economy of words become a beautiful legacy to pass on to generations yet unborn” (Mead and Grove 2003, 9). Furthermore, they continue to act as a reminder of the importance of te reo Māori to Māori identity.

---

⁷⁰ Fire. Here Tāmāti is making reference to relationship between fire and occupation of land.

⁷¹ Hapū of Rakaipaaka.

⁷² Axe.

Cowell suggests that “through interpreting whakataukī from the past, the thoughts that the ancestors held and their perspectives on different aspects of life are revealed” (2013, 20). She acknowledges that whakataukī are poetic, embody the uniqueness of the language and carry flair, imagery, metaphor and the wisdom of elders” (2013, 20). Furthermore, although the content of some whakataukī may be referring to cultural practices which are uncommon in today’s world, most whakataukī have meanings and values attached to them which are applicable, and can be adapted to contemporary contexts (Mead and Grove 2001, 9). In his interview, Hickson spoke of how the whakataukī, ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga, was reflected in everyday life for the Rakaipaaka community in Nuhaka today.

“We [did not] only have a hundred houses, we had heaps of houses because we could do things on our own. We didn’t need to live in a village where one chief told us how to do everything, [like] taught us how to fish and that, we all knew how to do it ourselves. That’s what I think ‘ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga’ means. That we had, more or less, not a chief, but someone that could speak for each family and that’s really seen today.

Like at the marae, I think Friday’s usually the busiest day. It’s the day of the tangi and someone has to peel all the spuds and potatoes, and there’s always someone doing it. And when you go into the marae, it’s not the same people as it is out the back, cause there’s heaps of people. The kaumātua have their jobs and they’ll stay out the front, and the women will stay in the kitchen, and they boys will stay out the back peel all the spuds and dig the holes. And that’s good because we don’t clash. Cause the boys don’t like a lot of the ladies in the kitchen [laughs] cause they’re too bossy, so they just come and hang out the back, and say ‘oh this is better, cruisy as, no one yelling at you’. Man in the kitchen, Nan will make you set the table up three times, take it down, set it back up, ‘put those plates out there Hickson’, ‘don’t put those plates on the table, take them back’ (laughs). God her and my mum both telling us two different stories so we just stay out of there.

But it’s good that mum and them step down and let Avon step up, she’s got the qualifications. And since a lot of our kaumātua have been dying, the two main ones – Nanny Dickie and Pa Graeme, there’s been a big hole left and a lot of the ladies in the kitchen, it’s been their turn to step up, jump on the pae. And then it was time for the younger ones to step up into the kitchen, and you can see that now.⁷³

Ngaha argues that “whakataukī, like pēpeha, are significant carriers of cultural history” (Ngaha 2014, 88). My research made it apparent that whakataukī are an important way of expressing a localised Māori identity for the Rakaipaaka community. In other words, the whakataukī, ‘ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga’ offered the Rakaipaaka community a way of expressing their Rakaipaakatanga, whilst at the same time asserting the importance of te reo Māori to Māori identities. Additionally, whakataukī acted as a framework of sorts through which some of my contributors spoke about the world, illustrated in Hickson’s response. The different ways that those in the Rakaipaaka community express themselves through language is reflective of the diversity inherent in Rakaipaakatanga.

Conclusion

---

⁷³ Here we can see the expression of another well-known whakataukī – *Ka pū te ruha, ka hao te rangatahi*, *The old net is cast aside, the new net goes a-catching* – which refers to the passing down of roles and responsibilities to the younger generations.

Ko Moumoukai tōku maunga, ko Ngā Nuhaka tōku awa, Ko Ngāti Rakaipaaka tōku iwi. To define my identity is to say my pēpeha. To say my pēpeha is to display my cultural histories and the foundations of my identity. Whenua, whakapapa, and te reo Māori are the foundations of Rakaipaakatanga and to be Rakaipaaka is to begin with these foundations. As I have moved through these sections, both the importance of these elements to Rakaipaakatanga, and how some Rakaipaaka people understand and express their importance, has been explored. For instance, whenua was expressed as a key component of Rakaipaakatanga partly because of its ancestral connections. Those I interviewed were clear, that the whenua was not an empty environment, a blank space, but a landscape which holds history and ancestors. Another example is that of whakapapa, which was articulated as an integral part of my contributors Rakaipaakatanga. In his interview, Koroniria said, “How do I see my connection to my tīpuna? Simple: without them there is no me or us. We are an extension of them”. In addition, the importance of te reo Māori to Rakaipaakatanga was linked to its use in articulating how my contributors understood the world around them. In following the lines of the becoming meshwork that is Rakaipaakatanga, I have also discussed some points of tension. These tensions often arise when expectations do not align with experience – in other words when fluidity and diversity does not fit into rigid and static frameworks established by a colonial agenda, and maintained by government forces, and some Māori. In discussing these points of tension, the koru has been a valuable metaphor, symbolising the way in which life changes and stays the same, whilst at the same time recognising that to consider change and movement in identity does not delegitimise or invalidate it — just because a koru grows does not mean it is not a koru.

Post-Settlement Futures

---

*Ki te kahore he whakakitenga ka ngaro te iwi
Without foresight or vision the people will be lost
- Kingi Tawhiao Potatau te Wherowhero*

When I asked Graeme what he saw in Rakaipaaka's post-settlement future he responded:

The future is important. Oh well for us [older ones] we might be gone in another few years but for you ones, the young ones, the mokopuna, do we have the identity? The mana - mana whenua, mana tangata? Do they know who they are and where they belong? Their cultural things? Is Rakaipaakatanga alive and working? To me, Treaty settlement is good and fine and gonna get a bit of pūtea⁷⁴ but don't nobody say that pūtea is gonna buy or gonna make all those things just happen, like the reo or the culture or the social things. We gotta do it ourselves. The Treaty's not gonna be the remedy for everything eh.

As previously discussed⁷⁵, Rakaipaaka are currently in the midst of Treaty settlement negotiations which they began actively participating in in the 1980s (The Ngāti Rakaipaaka Story 2014, 12). Acting on Crown policy, Rakaipaaka are now proceeding with negotiations as part of a Large Natural Grouping made up of cluster groups from the Te Wairoa district under the name of Te Tira Whakaemi o Te Wairoa (The Ngāti Rakaipaaka Story 2014, 3). Rakaipaaka in this sense is like many other hapū and iwi who have engaged in negotiations aimed at settling Māori historical grievances against the Crown, which date back as far as 1840 (Wheen and Hayward 2012, 13). These negotiations and the agreements that nearly always follow are declared by Crown policy to "settle all of [a] claimant group's historical claims against the Crown" (Office of Treaty Settlements N.D). This chapter will explore the role of Rakaipaakatanga in Rakaipaaka's post-settlement futures, with an emphasis on how Rakaipaaka aspirations may be fulfilled. After briefly outlining the settlement process to contextualise the discussion, I will argue the for postsettlement development models to be successful they must reflect the diverse range of Rakaipaakatanga present in the Rakaipaaka community. At the same time, the models need to be practical, responding to the challenges and problems Rakaipaaka face today and may face in the future. In essence, they must uplift and develop Rakaipaaka people in positive, sustainable, and Māori ways. I focus here on cultural aspects of Rakaipaaka's post-settlement futures rather than economic, social, and political development which have been covered elsewhere (Te Tira Whakaemi o Te Wairoa and The Crown 2012). This is not to suggest that economic, social, and political development are irrelevant or unnecessary. Rather, my decision to focus on a cultural aspect of Rakaipaaka's future was initiated by the information my contributors provided in interviews, whilst at the same time acknowledging the importance of fulfilling cultural aspirations as well as economic, social, and political ones.

Settlements generally culminate in an Act of Parliament which includes three parts – a Crown apology to the claimant group for "the Crown's actions or inactions", cultural redress for the claimant group, and financial and commercial redress for the claimant group (Wheen and Hayward 2012, 14). Nicola Wheen and Janine Hayward argue that although Treaty settlements are nearly always agreed upon, they do not necessarily provide full compensation for what was lost (2012, 15). To avoid a great

---

⁷⁴ Sum of money.

⁷⁵ See Chapter 1: Introduction - Community Profile.

burden for the taxpayer, redress instead focuses on three things: a recognition of the claimant's historical grievances; a restoration of the Crown and claimant's relationship, and; a Crown contribution to the claimant group's economic development (Wheen and Hayward 2012, 15). Along the same lines Dean Cowie explains that "it is rare for the Māori leaders to promote the settlement offer as one they consider to be fair and just. Instead, they tend to describe the offer as the best available at the time, which is better than the uncertainty of a litigated outcome, and an opportunity for the tribe to build its economic, cultural and social base" (2012, 54). Many Māori recognise the limited nature of Treaty settlements, but as Maria Bargh explains "this does not mean that they are irrelevant or unnecessary – it just means that most Māori organisations are pragmatic. Treaty settlements may provide opportunities for some change, but they will not deliver in all the changes Māori" desire (2012, 179). Such a sentiment was clear in Graeme's response regarding post-settlement.

Māori Models

There were three elements which interviewees expressed to me as being of utmost importance in the development of post-settlement models for Rakaipaaka. First, that they must be Māori. John in his interview asserted "We're not about creating Pākehā organisations, we're about creating our organisations based on our values, our understandings of self and identity and giving them expression in the future so they can look after our membership". Glen S. Coulthard (2007) emphasises the potential of self-determined development, resting on values, beliefs and needs of the community rather than recognition of settler ideals, not that these are so easily defined or separated. He refers to Indigenous activists of Canada explaining their movement into emancipatory politics which he argues is "less oriented around attaining an affirmative form of recognition from the settler-state and society, and more about critically revaluating, reconstructing and redeploying culture and tradition in ways that seek to prefigure . . . a radical alternative to the structural and psycho-affective facets of colonial domination" (Coulthard 2007, 456). Such a stance aligns with what many Māori consider to be a part of Tino Rangatiratanga – asserting and reinforcing the goal of allowing Māori to control their own culture, aspirations and destiny according to Māori definitions and understandings. Furthermore, Joseph asserts that "whatever institutional form the representative [Māori legal] entity takes, it is important to remember that the entity and its subsidiaries *represent* the tribe, they do not *replace* it . . . Identity precedes representation, not the other way around" (2012, 162). This, he asserts, means iwi must maintain a broad outlook rather than focusing narrowly on financial gain which could 'corporatise' Māori identity and representation. Cultural, social and political development are just as important to address as economic development. As Joseph concludes, "while competence in modern governance is . . . relevant in determining the integrity of the tribe in terms of representation and good governance, tribal identity and integrity (mana) are also critical in maintaining the group's distinct identity as Māori" (2012, 162).

Sustainable Models

Second, it was expressed that post-settlement models for Rakaipaaka must be sustainable. The use of the word sustainable is a reflection of its use by my contributors. Their use of the word did not emphasise any particular type of sustainability, for example economic or environmental, but more

expressed the desire for models to have long-term and intergenerational durability. During his interview, Tāmāti explained,

We've signed an Agreement in Principle with the Crown and now we've got to . . . get into the details of things . . . That's my retirement plan from the iwi [laughs]. But I do mean that seriously eh, it's not like we're trying to create a little fiefdom for ourselves to leverage off the Treaty settlement, like 'YEA I'm gonna be the next big chief', nah, no, I don't believe in that. I believe that everyone has a job to do at a point in time and then we must turn it over to others, we must let the young come through. Because that's the other big problem, successional planning. People nowadays they hold onto things to the bitter end, and there's no use lying on your deathbed like 'I now bequeath the paepae to...' [laughs] too bloody late, man, you should've bequeathed that 10 years ago and then you could have been there to guide those young ones to doing right on the marae type of thing. That's how we view it eh, this is our job for this point in time, and then we gotta turn it over to the others, the younger ones that come through.

In a similar vein, Michael Belgrave explains that “both the Crown and Māori need to acknowledge that settlements have always been contingent on the times that created them” (2012, 47). This suggests that the successfulness of post-settlement development is not solely based on its immediate achievements but also on its ability to adapt to new circumstances and endure new challenges. As Belgrave puts it, it cannot be “fixed and immutable” (2012, 47).

Practical Models

Finally, it was made clear to me from the interviews that post-settlement models for Rakaipaaka must be practical in terms of responding to the community's contemporary and future challenges and aspirations. On this, John stated,

I'd want us to have some ability to talk for ourselves and provide for ourselves, and I think part of that is creating a tribal infrastructure and some organisation. An organisation that can provide some benefits to members whatever those benefits might be. An organisation that can articulate what's important to us and who we are including engaging with government or local government or whomever else. I'd like to for us to find ways to, as part of those benefits to our members, to look at things like employment and other areas, education. But the biggest vision for me moving forward is creating our capacity to actually do something for ourselves, to actually have an organisation that can provide real benefits to us.

As previously discussed⁷⁶, one aspiration that was expressed by my contributors across the board, was the desire for Rakaipaaka people, particularly rangatahi⁷⁷, to feel comfortable and confident in their Rakaipaakatanga. My contributors expressed that they wanted Rakaipaaka people to feel a sense of belonging to the community and a sense of security in terms of knowing their place in the world. In his interview John explained,

---

⁷⁶ See Chapter 4: Rakaipaakatanga – Whakapapa.

⁷⁷ Young people,

The thing for me, which is a reflection of [my] work in the education space and in the social service space, is that what I do know is that having a secure identity helps create the kind of resilience you need to keep growing and developing in this world. So, you know, having a comfort in knowing where you're from and who you're related to and the pride that comes with that . . . I've seen the other side of things where people don't have secure identity and it's not all downhill for them but, you know, there's times in your life when that becomes particularly important. I think certainly in your teens and your later teens having some sense of belonging and some sense of understanding [of] who you are is really important in getting your confidence to take the journey in life.

The importance of Māori feeling comfortable and confident in their Māori identity has already been briefly explored in the Rakaipaakatanga chapter. However, it is important to emphasise again the significant effect a sense of security and confidence, in regards to cultural identity, can have on Māori youth living in and engaging with contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand society (Ngaha 2014, 91). When Hickson was explaining what Rakaipaaka meant to him he commented, "That's who we are, and if you don't know who you are, you're lost. I know who I am now and, you know, it just empowers you, makes you feel better".

Helping Rakaipaaka people to feel confident and comfortable in their Rakaipaakatanga was an overarching aspiration which was included in various other ambitions for the community. My understanding, from discussions with my contributors, is that a sense of security and confidence in Rakaipaaka identity is fostered and maintained through many means, one of which I will explore here, and which was expressed as a community aspiration in itself – the learning and binding of connections to people and land. In discussing this desire I will consider some taonga anamata that may be harnessed to work towards fulfilling them. Ngā taonga can be translated as resources, whilst anamata can be translated as future. Here, ngā taonga anamata refers to the new assets, resources and skills that are present in moving to a new stage of existence, in this case post-settlement. This does not mean that those things were not present in the past, or that they are not present now, but that they are things which are valuable to the people of Rakaipaaka in looking to the future. In other words, ngā taonga anamata can be described as cultural capital for the future⁷⁸.

Making and Binding Connections

As explored in the discussion of whakapapa, learning and binding your connections to others, also known as whanaungatanga, has been shown to help foster a secure sense of identity. How the learning and binding of kinship networks may be promoted in the future should be addressed by Rakaipaaka. Two things are important to this task; the popular story of Te Huki, a well-known ancestor of the Te Wairoa district, and the Rakaipaaka's strong internet presence.

Descended from Rakaihikuroa, the brother of Rakaipaaka, Te Huki is remembered for his great networking skills which created unity amongst Te Wairoa people. By marrying himself and his children into many different tribes of the area he created what is known as Te-Kupenga-a-Te-Huki or 'the net of Te Huki' (Himona 1989). He began his networking task by marrying the daughters of three influential chiefs – Te Rangi-tohumare of the Ngai Te Whatuiapiti tribe of Heretaunga, Te Ropuhina of Nuhaka, and Rewanga of Titirangi at Gisborne. Rather than making home or settling permanently with his wives, Te

---

⁷⁸ I would like to acknowledge Vincent Olsen-Reeder for his insights and explanation on this point.

Huki visited each of them in turn helping to build his network throughout the area from Turanganui to Heretaunga. With Te Rangi-tohumare, Te Huki had two sons and a daughter. His first son, Puruaaute, settled in Te Wairoa marrying Te Mate-kāinga-i-te-tihi. There he became the “centre float of the spreading net of Te Huki” and is the ancestor of many chiefs of the area (Himona 1989). His second son Mātaitai settled in Mahia and is the ancestor of Rakaipaaka chief Ihaka Whaanga, as well as many others. Te Huki’s daughter, Hine-raru, was taken to Porangahau where she married Hopara and had Ngarangiwakaupoko who went on to become the southern post of Te-Kupenga-a-Te-Huki. With Te Ropuhina, Te Huki had three sons – Te Rakato who settled in Mahia and from who the Ngai Te Rakato tribe descend; Tureia who settled in Nuhaka, and; Te Rehu who also settled in Nuhaka and who the Ngai Te Rehu tribe descend from. Finally, with his third wife Rewanga, Te Huki had a daughter, Te Umupapa who married Marukawiti and had Ngawhaka-tatare who became the eastern post of Te-Kupengaa-Te-Huki in Turanganui. Te-Kupenga-a-Te-Huki was created over three generations, and today, thirteen generations later, “it still serves to unite the people” (Himona 1989).

Today, there are new technologies which can help maintain those connections originally made by Te Huki, and the sense of unity that was associated with them. Modern communicative technology like social media sites can act as whanaungatanga tools. Vivienne Kennedy, for example, has said that the internet is “effective as a tool for connecting whānau with, and maintaining, social networks” (2010, 11). She considers social media websites such as Facebook which she suggests “are becoming increasingly popular tools to establish and maintain connections with whānau” (2010, 16). Moreover, the websites are often popular amongst rangatahi. One Facebook page used by the Rakaipaaka community, Te Iwi o Rakaipaaka, has 1,040 members⁷⁹ and acts as a modern site for kinship creation and continuity. The page provides a snapshot of Rakaipaaka kinship, both literally and figuratively. Members of the page regularly post photos, old and new, as a way of prompting discussion most often regarding their position within the Rakaipaaka community. For instance, members of the page often post a photo of their parents or grandparents along with a small written piece of how they connect to Rakaipaaka. Esta expressed her appreciation of the page in her interview:

Yea its cool to see everyone putting up their old photos and its random as when you get people that are like ‘oh anybody know who this is?’ and even if [the photo is] 50 years old or something people know . . . But its mean that if you have those pages you can still connect with people, you still get to see people from when we were little - Esta.

The page is also used to promote community events such as marae sports tournaments, gala days, and kapa haka⁸⁰ performances. Esta often uses the page to update those living outside of Nuhaka about local happenings, posting photos of group walks up Moumoukai, of Rakaipaaka mokopuna at the Nuhaka Bridge (a well-known swimming spot), and of special buildings, including Rakaipaaka’s six marae and various churches. In her interview she explained, “I go on that page [Te Iwi o Rakaipaaka] . . . [and add] loads of photos of what we’ve been doing here so that everyone else that doesn’t live here can see what we do, see everybody”. Underlying these different uses, is a desire to maintain Rakaipaaka connectedness and community, something which was expressed by Irene in her interview - “Yes we are [using Facebook], to stay connected to our families - that’s what it’s all about”.

Important to note is that the use of the internet here has proved itself as an avenue for extending that sense of community and connectedness beyond the geographical boundaries of Nuhaka. Members have been asked to direct other whānau they are in touch with, to ‘like’ the page which has resulted in Rakaipaaka members who live all over Aotearoa New Zealand and abroad gaining access to a site where

---

⁷⁹ As of 19.02.2015.

⁸⁰ Māori cultural dance.

they can connect with other members of the Rakaipaaka community and express their Rakaipaakatanga. This was something John expressed as an important element of Rakaipaaka's post-settlement future:

I am passionate about Rakaipaaka development but for me that's to reach Rakaipaaka wherever they are . . . We did an analysis using census methodologies to figure out how many people, based on the last census, are from home, from the Wairoa district, and I think we calculated the figure of about 36,000 . . . The population in our district is about 12,000 and Rakaipaaka is part of that. So most people from Rakaipaaka don't live at home. So I'm very passionate about Rakaipaaka development but I want Rakaipaaka development and Rakaipaaka pride to extend beyond Nuhaka, the Valley and our tribal domain because that's where our people are. So we have to find better ways to connect them to their tribal identity and give them some because to celebrate - John.

Taking advantage of Rakaipaaka's internet presence could act in response to the current demographics of the iwi which has a large diaspora (81 percent live in urban areas with populations of 1,000 or more (2006 census), while 64.7 percent live in main urban areas with populations of 30,000 or more (2013 census))⁸¹. Michael Hennesy suggests that the ability to access information which has previously been difficult to retrieve for those that live away from traditional geographies is one of the primary benefits of using the internet as a tool for making and binding connections (2014, 235).

The possibility for Facebook, and this particular page, to provide a place where connectedness and community can be maintained, is an important factor to consider. However, the use of the internet and social media sites for these purposes has its limits, and it is important to note that online avenues act as a supplement to more traditional offline avenues, rather than making them unnecessary or irrelevant. For instance, when I asked Graeme what he thought of Rakaipaaka on Facebook he responded

It is the way of the future, to keep contact and that and keep people informed. But I wouldn't say put whakapapa and that on there. Yea I wouldn't like that and your Papa Kem⁸² wouldn't like that either. He didn't even like it in the newspaper because then people used to say the newspaper will end up in the toilet, wharepaku, longdrop – Graeme.

Hesitation to have whakapapa documented in such a public arena is a common concern. Here Graeme's concern focused on the treatment of whakapapa, acknowledging the status of it as a taonga which could easily be mistreated. Reihana explains that previously "whakapapa has been collected by trawling through handwritten manuscripts, analysing inscriptions on headstones, skimming through photo albums and viewing archived records held in libraries, parishes, museums, genealogical societies and registry offices . . . For Māori the collation of whakapapa . . . also included the passing of whakapapa from previous generations through oral traditions" (2014, 6). Those that I interviewed and who were knowledgeable about whakapapa often learnt in these ways. As Reihana goes on to explain, these methods of collection often rely on establishing and maintaining trusting relationships, often over "many cups of tea" (2014, 7). Moreover, the information gathered is treated as taonga and often guarded against those "who did not hold the necessary 'qualifications'" (Reihana 2011, 7). Margaret Mutu explains that the knowledge necessary for the verification of wide-ranging whakapapa is often held by only a select few. She states that "included in this knowledge [is] the multiplicity of connections to other iwi throughout the country [and] it is through the wise use and application of this knowledge that its

---

⁸¹ Information regarding Rakaipaaka members living in urban areas with a population of more than 1,000 was not included in the 2013 census.

⁸² Tohunga Whakapapa – whakapapa expert.

holders can bind the entire iwi together” (2005, 121). In addition, the misuse of this information can cause great damage, which is why, Mutu explains, “many whakapapa are closely guarded and only made available to those considered to be the appropriate holders and guardians of such knowledge” (2005, 121).

From the conversations I had with my contributors it was clear there was still a lot of wariness about putting whakapapa on the internet and social media sites such as Facebook, perhaps for these reasons, although it was not made clear. It was clear though that the release of extensive whakapapa information was still confined to more traditional means of retrieval, for example through face-to-face teachings. However, many Rakaipaaka people are embracing Facebook, and the Rakaipaaka page in particular, as a place where they can share a little of their own connections to others. For instance, the posting of old photos that has already been mentioned. Reihana explains that in “this technologically advanced age . . . Māori have experienced a shift in attitude concerning their whakapapa and the sharing of it where the ‘ordinary’ could now share snippets of information heard in family gatherings and such like on Facebook” (2011, 7). Again, it is important to understand that the sharing and learning of whakapapa ‘snippets’ online acts as a supplement to more traditional means, rather than making them irrelevant.

The idea that a secure sense of Rakaipaaka identity is fostered by making connections, and thus situating oneself in a set of relationships, also extends to making connections with the land. As Reihana outlines, contextualising Māori identity comes from building and maintaining relationships with both people and the environment (2014, 11). Thus, another important limit to consider is the ability to access knowledge on the internet which has previously been geographically bound, as it may render geography irrelevant. This would be in direct opposition to the understanding of whenua as vital to Māori identity, an understanding that was expressed to me during my fieldwork and which I have discussed in the previous chapter. John suggested in his interview, “You can’t escape the fact that if you want to understand fully your maunga, well go for a walk up it. You know we could live in Sydney and I could describe to you our tribal history, could talk to you about Mahia, Nuhaka awa, Moumoukai, and then there’s when you walk on it”. Considering the benefits of the internet and social media sites as complementary to traditional whanaungatanga methods may be more helpful than not using them at all. Much like other internet-based Māori initiatives promoting cultural knowledge (for example Te Wehi Nui⁸³), Facebook pages should not be expected to replace traditional methods but to work alongside them in a way that does not disregard tikanga. Reihana argues that the notion of Ngāti Ranana, Ngāti GC, and Ngāti Pukamata⁸⁴ highlights changes in the understanding of place in Māori identity, particularly those Māori who have found ways to take traditional protocol and apply it locally (Reihana 2014, 14). Reihana further suggests that Facebook gives members the ability “to connect, communicate and collaborate regardless of distance” (2014, 18). Online and offline connections can co-exist, making it easier for those that live away to maintain connections whilst also maintaining the importance of offline kanohi ki te kanohi. As John suggested, “it can’t all be focused at home but I think home is an important part of it”.

Conclusion

To focus on cultural aspects of Rakaipaaka’s post-settlement futures, is not say that economic and social development are irrelevant or unnecessary. In actual fact, the success of many cultural identity

---

⁸³ See Hennesy 2014 listed in Bibliography.

⁸⁴ London based Māori, Gold Coast Australian based Māori, and Facebook iwi, respectively.

development initiatives rely on the social health and wellbeing of communities and often cannot be implemented without financial support. Bargh outlines that the Crown “seeks to improve the economic position of Māori through economic development, assuming that this will ultimately improve social and political conditions for Māori” (2012, 166). My decision here to focus on a cultural aspect of Rakaipaaka’s future was initiated by the information my contributors provided in interviews. At the same time it recognises what Annette Sykes has declared – that social, cultural and political aspirations need to be brought to the centre of future development as well as economic (2010, 5). As Dean Cowie has made clear “the settlement process is not just about spending money and reaching settlements. Loftier nation-building outcomes are being realised. The process restores the honour, or moral legitimacy, of the Crown to govern on behalf of *all* New Zealanders. It also affords to Māori the opportunity to take real ownership of a future that is different from their past” (2012, 64). Furthermore, my focus does not look to criticise those iwi who have emphasised economic redress and development. As Bargh points out “successive governments have made it clear that this kind of process and redress is all that is on offer” (2012, 168). Instead, I aim to express that a focus on economic development which ignores cultural, social, and political needs and aspirations, “falls short of Māori expectations for settlements to provide the opportunity for larger debates and deeper change” (2012, 168). Again we might return to Graeme’s words which began this chapter, and which expressed the pragmatism of many Māori engaged in the settlement process. As Bargh explains, “in light of the Crown’s process and emphasis for settlements many iwi have decided to take a pragmatic stance and in the short term accept the limited nature of Crown settlements with the expectation that in the long term broader change may still occur or be forced by iwi” (2012, 169).

He Whakamutunga – Conclusion

I began this project looking to celebrate the contemporary, dynamic, diverse and flourishing Rakaipaaka community that I have grown up with. I wanted to articulate Rakaipaaka understandings of Rakaipaakatanga. It quickly became apparent, however, that Rakaipaakatanga was not something that was easy to articulate. In his foreword to Paul Farmer's *Pathologies of Power*, Amartya Sen writes that "a phenomenon can be either characterised by a terse definition or described with examples", the latter allowing for an embracing of blurriness that is inevitable when trying to understand abstract concepts (2004, xiii). Following the latter, I have used examples from my contributors as a way of prompting understanding, rather than attempting to create a concise definition. The examples they have provided often weave together multiple lines of life and identity, and it was through the exploration of these lines, and the meshworks they create, that this thesis has presented ways of being Rakaipaaka today.

In 1975, John Rangihau wrote, "You know the number of people, Pākehā people, who know better than I do how I am to be a Māori just amazes me . . . I am constantly reminded of the number of Pākehā people who know better than I do what is good for me. It is about time we were allowed to think for ourselves and to say which things we want and why we want them. And to say that we do things for our reasons and not for reasons set down by Pākehā experts" (232). In the introduction I outlined three aims I hoped to fulfil in writing this thesis, two of which align with Rangihau's views:

- To uplift the voices of my participants as holders of valuable knowledge regarding Rakaipaakatanga and iwi identity more broadly
- And to privilege Māori worldviews which naturalise and prioritise the aspirations of Māori.

An important part of fulfilling these aims was the use of kaupapa Māori methodology, which also responded to a history of unethical and harmful research done *on* Māori and its damaging effects (Smith 1999). In using Kaupapa Māori methodology I was able to privilege Māori ways of knowing, being and doing, assuming the validity of a Māori worldview which helped towards fulfilling my aims. My focus, in my methodology section, on three Māori principles – Tino Rangatiratanga, Whanaungatanga and Manaakitanga – was a reflection of my experience doing kaupapa Māori research with the Rakaipaaka community. Furthermore, this research has given space for some Rakaipaaka voices to speak about themselves, their understandings and experiences that are true for them as individuals who embody a particular history, present and future, and who know best what it means to be them. In doing so, I have illustrated that Rakaipaaka knowledge is distinctive and vital to Rakaipaaka existence.

I have discussed three foundational elements that are integral to Rakaipaakatanga – whenua, whakapapa and, te reo Māori. These acted as over-arching and inter-linking themes, illustrated by and articulated through my contributors' examples. Their narratives demonstrated the everyday complexities inherent in these elements. Whilst whenua, whakapapa, and te reo Māori each had seemingly simple and succinct guidelines for fulfilling Rakaipaakatanga on the surface, underneath was much more complicated. Those who contributed to this thesis, both young and old, tāne and wāhine⁸⁵, iwi ahi kā and iwi taura here, have formed their Rakaipaakatanga in the face of multiple social, political and cultural influences. In presenting their understandings and experiences, which are diverse and

---

⁸⁵ Men and women.

complex, I have demonstrated the constant becoming that is inherent in life and identity. Underlying my contributors' narratives was a desire to find a sense of belonging in the world, a place in the meshwork of relationships that make up te ao Māori. In doing this, they bound together the past, present and future in multiple ways.

The act of establishing a coherent narrative about one's life and identity often made visible authenticity standards which Rakaipaaka people are held up against, by themselves and others, to fulfil. Despite my contributors' resistance to "being put into a box" (Liz) or "being trapped in time" (Tāmāti) they continue to face the realities of the settlement process, colonisation, and authenticity debates. These often tend to emphasise a perceived black and white world where boundaries of identity are strict and distinctive rather than blurred and amorphous. Here, the koru framework is particularly valuable in problematizing notions of static social organisation and identity. A collaboration of sorts between Becoming and Kaupapa Māori, the koru framework allowed me to recognise the diverse and adaptive qualities of Rakaipaaka people who continued to engage with traditional markers of identity in new ways. At the same time, it supports the argument that change and movement in Rakaipaakatanga did not necessarily signal the assimilation or disappearance of Rakaipaaka Māori.

In Chapter Five: Post-Settlement Futures, I have considered how these elements of Rakaipaakatanga may look in post-settlement futures for the iwi. I have asserted the importance of diversity as well as unity, and argued that for post-settlement development models to be successful they must reflect the diversity of Rakaipaakatanga present. At the same time, I demonstrated the need for the models to be practical, responding to the challenges Rakaipaaka face today and may face in the future. This means establishing development models that uplift and develop Rakaipaaka people in positive, sustainable, and Māori ways. However, the colonial agenda, and some Māori people who take on the colonial agenda, make this difficult. Contributors in this study, however, focused on the securing of Rakaipaakatanga, particularly for Rakaipaaka rangatahi. They emphasised the potential of ngā taonga anamata which may be harnessed to fulfil aspirations regarding post-settlement futures, whilst at the same time recognising that these have limits. The understandings and experiences of my contributors should not discourage those who have not yet, or are still working on, aligning with community and self expectations of being Rakaipaaka. Furthermore, there was acknowledgement amongst my contributors that expectations which are motivated by rigid and static identity frameworks may need to be adapted according to contemporary circumstances. Overall, my contributors were eager to find and encourage solutions that created a sense of belonging through the making and binding of connections.

The intention of this thesis was not to represent the experiences and understandings of all Rakaipaaka people. Rather it looked to make visible the diversity of the collective through the use of some understandings and experiences. Through nine in-depth and detailed interviews, I have explored the multiplicity of factors that influence the formation and narratives of Rakaipaakatanga by those who self-identify as Rakaipaaka. Whilst it may have been useful to survey more voices, including those who did not identify with their Rakaipaakatanga so strongly or so confidently, the scope of the study limited my ability to include them. This, I suggest, is a limitation which signals a possible avenue for further research. There were also a number of other observations that suggest useful avenues for future research. For instance, iwitanga and Māoritanga are expressed in multiple arenas, acknowledging the experiences of Māori, and the communities they belong to (Douglas 2014). For instance, Marae offer a wealth of research possibilities concerning its role as a traditional and contemporary site of identity expression for Māori. Additionally, the importance and meaning of whānau to Rakaipaakatanga, and iwitanga more broadly, could be an interesting topic to explore further. In her interview, Esta explained "when I think of Rakaipaaka I think of family, I think of our ancestors, I think of our tīpuna, I think of the future generations, our rangitahi, the young ones of today and what they're gonna be tomorrow". Some

examples of the importance of whānau to Rakaipaakatanga have been touched on in this thesis, though further study would garner some interesting results.

Despite such limitations, this thesis makes valuable contributions; within anthropology, it contributes to the study of contemporary iwi and Māori identity, identity formation processes and Māori social organisation. It also contributes to a growing literature in anthropology which uses Māori understandings and Māori participants to understand Māori realities. The anthropological approach I have taken here has shown one way in which ethnographic accounts of individual and collective identities may be presented. It also contributes to the literature on contemporary Rakaipaaka peoples, and Rakaipaaka experiences and understandings of Rakaipaakatanga, by exploring the ways that Rakaipaaka identities are articulated, maintained, and transformed (The Ngāti Rakaipaaka Story 2014). On this note, I hope that it will also be considered as an important piece of work, documenting Rakaipaaka at this particular point in time, in the middle of an important process that will have some influence on how the iwi looks in the future. As well as providing space for unique and important voices, this study hopes to encourage dialogue concerning the experience and identities of iwi-affiliated Māori in contemporary contexts, and iwi post-settlement futures. My contributor's experiences, which have been presented here, may add to understandings of the complexity and dynamism of iwi identity today which could be expanded to accommodate for the diversity of experiences lived (Gonzalez 2010). Dismantling ideas that promote inflexible understandings of what it means to be Rakaipaaka, and more generally what it means to be Māori, means acknowledging and recognising diverse, dynamic, complex realities. Recognising these realities is important to building positive and sustainable Māori and iwi futures, and thus this work also contributes to literature regarding Māori development.

I want to finish here with reference to the hopefulness and positivity that radiated from the community during my fieldwork. On this, Irene stated,

“What do I see in the future? I just see Rakaipaaka continuing on, thriving with the things that they value. You know their cultural values and beliefs will continue. It'll continue, regardless of the reo being limited amongst our men and our women. It will carry on and we'll be able to adapt but the things that are important to us will continue because there's a lot of people that have that willingness to make sure good things continue to develop and grow”.

Of course, Liz, in another classic nanny move, told me a story that totally encompassed the Rakaipaakatanga I have spent a whole thesis trying to explain. Here, she talks about a wānanga held at Tane-nui-a-Rangi marae in February 2014 which members of the Rakaipaaka community were invited to attend and which included a walk up Moumoukai amongst other activities. It is a story of whenua, whakapapa and te reo Māori, but it is also a story of becoming. Most importantly it is a story that expresses that hope for the future.

We had breakfast before we went up Moumoukai because it didn't look too good. Uncle Grae was at home here, and funnily enough the maunga was sitting in the sunshine, but down by Tane it was all drizzly. Anyway we decided 'right we're going'. I got three quarters of the way up the maunga and all I've got for it is a black toenail. It was pushing on my shoe and I had to come back down, my cousin and I. Her knees were giving way so I said 'come on then, let's go back down'. My son has been saying to me 'Mum, I haven't been up there' and I said 'well I'm not sure I'm ready to tackle it again, my son' [laughs].

So when we got back I said to the rest of them, 'right you've got two hours, off you go to Morere for a swim'. Round two o'clock I got a group together and I said we're gonna write

a waiata⁸⁶. Our waiata's about how we felt going up Moumoukai. You know all this land of ours, what does it mean to us? And then I asked Esta if she would help us to create a poi⁸⁷, because you know the boys were busy doing the haka with Hickson.

Later that evening, I said 'right can you do a poi with us?', and what she loved about the kōrero I'd given was the connection between us and Hinemanuhiri and that was the poi that she wanted to do. She said to me 'Aunty, can you write something?' and I got the piece of paper and I'm thinking 'what can I say?', 'how can we say this?' So I wrote some kupu⁸⁸ on it and we made our poi the storyteller. And what was it telling? This connection between us because that's what she wanted. And she came down Sunday morning before she went to church to help teach it, and that's why I just have so much aroha⁸⁹ for the young ones, because it'll happen now, it'll happen. That binding will happen because our young ones are making it happen.

But it's our oldies. I think that lots more kōrero has to be done with the older generation, not the younger generation. Looking at them they will be our future, they will. I'm just so proud of them. Every time I watch them I just get this sense inside of me, of Rakaipaaka's on the right track. They will make sure that this binding takes place because it's happening with them, with all of them.

This wānanga was so different from the first one, because it was all young people came to this one and it was just amazing. Apparently they did the haka up Moumoukai and it was fantastic. And you can see the passion when they do it. When we brought Uncle Grae out Kahungunu when we were going to bury him, the marae was full and outside there was a whole lot of people and they stood and did their haka to their Pa Graham and I thought 'oh my God'. They will be our future, they are the future, they are our future. And if we continue with this strong feeling of identity I think that Rakaipaaka's in good hands.

---

⁸⁶ Song.

⁸⁷ A light ball on a string which is swung or twirled rhythmically to sung accompaniment.

⁸⁸ Words.

⁸⁹ Love.

Rārangi Pukapuka - Bibliography

Aikman-Dodd, Pounamu Jade.

2014 Made of Many Threads: Identity as a Vibrant Tapestry. *In* Maranga Mai! Te Reo and Marae in Crisis. Merata Kawharu, ed. Pp. 211-218. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Ballara, Angela.

1998 Iwi: The dynamics of Māori tribal organisation from c. 1769 to c. 1945. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Barcham, Manuhua.

1998 The Challenge of Urban Māori: Reconciling Conceptions of Indigeneity and Social Change. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 39(3):303-314.

2000. '(De)constructing Indigeneity'. In Ivison, D., P. Patton, & W. Sanders (Eds.), *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 137-151.

Bargh, Maria.

2012 The Post-settlement World (So Far): Impacts for Māori. *In* Treaty of Waitangi Settlements. Nicola R. Wheen and Janine Hayward, eds. Pp. 166-181. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited.

Barlow, C.

1991 Tikanga whakaaro: Key concepts in Māori culture. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Barnes, Helen Moewaka.

2000 Kaupapa Māori: explaining the ordinary. New Zealand: Whariki Research Group, University of Auckland.

Barrington, J. M.

1970 A Historical Review of Policies and Provisions. *In* Introduction to Māori Education. J. Ewing and J. Shallcrass. Wellington: New Zealand University Press.

Belgrave, Michael.

2012 Negotiations and Settlements. *In* Treaty of Waitangi Settlements. Nicola R. Wheen and Janine Hayward, eds. Pp. 29-47. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited.

Bishop, Russell.

1996 Collaborative Research Stories: Whakawhanaungatanga. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Borrell, B.

2005 Livin in the City Ain't so Bad: Cultural Diversity of South Auckland Rangatahi. Master's thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Carter, L.

2011 The Impact of changing Māori demographics on Treaty settlement governance structures. <http://posttreatysettlements.org.nz>, February 2, 2015.

Chen, Mai.

2012 Post-settlement Implications for Māori-Crown Relations. *In* Treaty of Waitangi Settlements. Nicola R. Wheen and Janine Hayward, eds. Pp. 182-200. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited.

Christie, Michael.

2001 Aboriginal Knowledge on the Internet. *Ngoonjook* (19):33-50.

Coulthard, Glen S.

2007 Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the 'Politics of Recognition' in Canada. *Contemporary Political Theory* (6):437-460.

Cowell, Jamie.

2013. He riri tā te tawa uho, he riri tā te tawa para. Master's Thesis. Auckland University of Technology.

Cowie, Dean.

2012 The Treaty Settlement Process. *In* Treaty of Waitangi Settlements. Nicola R. Wheen and Janine Hayward, eds. Pp. 48-64. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited.

Dana, Léo and Waata Hipango Jr.

2011 Planting seeds of enterprise: Understanding Māori perspectives on the economic application of flora and fauna in Aotearoa (New Zealand). *Journal of Enterprising Communities, People and Places in the Global Economy* 5(3):199-211.

Deloughrey, Elizabeth.

2007 Routes and Roots: Navigating Caribbean and Pacific Island Literatures. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

DeWalt, Kathleen M. and Billie R. DeWalt.

2011 Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers. 2nd edition. United Kingdom: Rowman Altamira.

Douglas, Sarsha-Leigh.

2014 Outcasts and Orchestrators; Finding Indigeneity in Contemporary Aotearoa Punk Culture. Masters Thesis, Victoria University of Wellington.

Durie, Mason.

1998 Te Mana, Te Kāwanatanga: The Politics of Māori Self-Determination. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

2005 Ngā tai matatū: Tides of Māori Endurance. Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, Deborah.

2013 Looks Like Daylight; Voices of Indigenous Kids. Toronto: Groundwood Books.

Farmer, Paul.

2005 Pathologies of Power: health, human rights, and the new war on the poor: with a new preface by the author/Paul Farmer; foreword by Amartya Sen. Berkley: University of California Press.

Finlayson, Christopher.

2014 Agreement in Principle signed with the iwi and hapū of Te Wairoa.
<https://www.national.org.nz/news/news/media-releases/detail/2014/06/11/agreement-inprinciple-signed-with-the-iwi-and-hapu-of-te-wairoa>, accessed June 12, 2014.

Gera, Kieren.

2014 He Toto, He Kanohi- True Blood. *Salient* 77(12):16-17.

Gilroy, Paul.

1993 *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

González, Christina M.

2010 'Be(com) ing' Ngāti Kahungunu in the Diaspora: Iwi Identity and Social Organisation in Wellington. Masters Thesis, Māori Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.

Hall, Stuart.

1990 Cultural identity and diaspora. *In Identity: Community, Culture and Difference*. J. Rutherford, ed. Pp. 222-237. London: Lawrence of Wishart.

Henare, Amiria.

2006 Ngā rakau a te Pākehā: Reconsidering Māori Anthropology. Paper for the ASA 2003 edited volume *Anthropology and Science: epistemologies in practice* (coming out with Berg, 2007) - Final Draft.
https://www.academia.edu/350428/Nga_rakau_a_te_pakeha_reconsidering_Māori_Anthropology, October 4, 2014.

Hennesy, Michael.

2014 Ngā Taonga Kōrero and the Modern World. *In Maranga Mai! Te Reo and Marae in Crisis*. Merata Kawharu, ed. Pp. 219-245. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Himona, Ross.

1989 Te Kupenga a Te Huki; the Network of Te Huki. Te Putatara.
<http://maaori.com/whakapapa/tehuki.htm>, October 1, 2014.

Hingangaroa-Smith, Graham.

2012 Interview: Kaupapa Māori: The dangers of domestication. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 47(2):10-20.

Hobson, Jennifer and Stephanie Cook.

2011 Social media for Researchers: Opportunities and Challenges. *MAI Review, Te Kokonga* (30):1-4.

Hokowhitu, Brendan.

2013 Producing Indigeneity. *In* *Indigenous in the City; Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation*. Evelyn Peters and Chris Andersen, eds. Pp. 354-376. Canada: UBC Press.

Ingold, Tim.

1993 The Temporality of the Landscape. *World Archaeology* 25(2):152-174.

2007 *Lines: A Brief History*. London: Routledge.

2011 Rethinking the animate, reanimating thought. *Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology* 71(1)920.

Irwin, Kathie.

1994 Māori Research Methods and Processes: An exploration. *Sites* 28:24-43.

Jackson, Moana.

2007 Globalisation and the Colonising State of Mind. *In* *Resistance: An Indigenous Response to Neoliberalism*. Maria Bargh, ed. Pp. 167-182. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.

Joseph, Robert.

2012 Unsettling Treaty Settlements: Contemporary Māori Identity and representation challenges. *In* *Treaty of Waitangi Settlements*. Nicola R. Wheen and Janine Hayward, eds. Pp. 151-165. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited.

Ka'ai, Tānia M. and Rawinia Higgins.

2004 Te ao Māori: Māori world-view. *In* *Ki Te Whaiao: An Introduction to Māori Culture and Society*. Tānia Ka'ai, John Moorfield, Michael P. J. Reilly and Sharon Mosley, eds. Pp. 13-25. Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand.

Kennedy, Vivienne.

2010 Social Network Analysis and Research with Māori collectives. *MAI Review* (3):1-21.

Kidman, J.

2012 The Land Remains: Māori youth and the politics of belonging. *Alternative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 8(2):189-202.

King, Michael.

1992 Introductions: New Directions. *In* Te Ao Hurihuri, the World Moves On: Aspects of Māoritanga. Michael King, ed. Pp. 15-20. Wellington: Hicks Smith & Sons.

Kukutai, Tahu.

2013 The Structure of Urban Māori Identities. *In* Indigenous in the City; Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation. Evelyn Peters and Chris Andersen, eds. Pp. 311-333. Canada: UBC Press.

Kupu Taea.

2014 Alternatives to anti-Māori themes in news media.
<http://www.trc.org.nz/alternativesanti-Māori-themes-news-media>, November 20, 2014.

Liu, James H., Tim McCreanor, Tracey McIntosh and Teresia Teaiwa, eds.

2005 Introduction: Constructing New Zealand Identities. *In* New Zealand Identities; Departures and Destinations. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Lumby, Bronwyn.

2010 Cyber-Indigeneity: Urban Indigenous identity on Facebook. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education* 39(Supplement):68-75.

Maaka, Roger.

2003 Perceptions, Conceptions and Realities: A Study of the Tribe in Māori Society in the Twentieth Century. PhD Thesis, University of Canterbury.

Macalister, J.

2005 A Dictionary of Māori words in New Zealand English. Melbourne, Oxford University Press.

McNatty, William.

2001 Whanaungatanga. Paper written for Psychology Department, University of Waikato.

Mead, H. and N. Grove.

2003 Ngā pēpeha a ngā tīpuna: The sayings of ancestors. Wellington: Victoria University.

Metge, J.

1995 New growth from old: The whānau in the modern world. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Mita, Henare.

2011 Rakaipaaka Cultural Values Assessment Report – Roading/Revetment Proposal for the Nuhaka-Opoutama Road. Wairoa, New Zealand: Ko Rakaipaaka Te Iwi.

Mitira, Tiaki Hikawera.

1972 Takitimu. New Zealand: Reed Publishing.

Moeke-Pickering.

1996 Māori Identity within Whanau: A review of literature. Hamilton: University of Waikato.

Moreton-Robinson, Aileen and Maggie Walter.

2010 Indigenous Methodologies in Social Research. *In* Social Research Methods. Maggie Walter, ed. Chapter 22. Melbourne, Oxford University Press.

Morgan, George.

2006 Unsettled Places; Aboriginal People and Urbanisation in New South Wales. South Australia: Wakefield Press.

Mutu, Margaret.

2005 In search of the missing Māori links - maintaining both ethnic identity and linguistic integrity in the revitalization of the Māori language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 172:117–132.

Ngaha, Arapera.

2014 Te Reo Māori and Māori Identity: What's in a Maunga? *In* Maranga Mai! Te Reo and Marae in Crisis. Merata Kawharu, ed. Pp. 71-96. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Nuhaka School Foreword.

N.D. NZ-HAWKES-BAY-N-POVERTY-BAY-L Archives.
<http://archiver.rootsweb.ancestry.com/th/read/NZ-HAWKES-BAY-N-POVERTY-BAY/200601/1138586389>, September 9, 2014.

O'Carroll, A. D.

2013 Virtual whanaungatanga: Māori utilizing social networking sites to attain and maintain relationships. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 9 (3):230-245.

Office of Treaty Settlements.

N.D. What is a Treaty Settlement. <http://www.ots.govt.nz/>, February 1, 2015.

Okeroa, Erina.

2012 Unfurling routes of self-determination in Aotearoa New Zealand; The Black Women's Movement, 1978-1982. Master's Thesis, Victoria University of Wellington.

Penetito, Wally T.

2011 Kaupapa Māori education: Research as the exposed edge. *In* Kei Tua o te Pae Hui proceedings: The challenges of Kaupapa Māori research in the 21st century, Pipitea Marae, Wellington 5-6 May 2001. J. Hutchings, H. Potter and K. Taupo, eds. Pp. 44-48. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Education Research, Wellington.

Peters, Evelyn and Chris Andersen, eds.

2013 *Indigenous in the City; Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation*. Canada: UBC Press.

Pihama, Leonie, Fiona Cram, and Sheila Walker.

2002 Creating methodological space: A literature review of Kaupapa Māori research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 25(1):30-44.

Poata-Smith, Evan.

2004 The Changing Contours of Māori Identity and the Treaty Settlement Process. *In* The Waitangi Tribunal. Janine Hayward and Nicola Wheen, eds. Pp. 165-183. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

Rangihau, John.

1992 [1975] Being Māori. *In* Te Ao Hurihuri, The World Moves On: Aspects of Māoritanga. Michael King, ed. Pp. 221-233. Wellington: Hicks Smith & Sons.

Rangiheuea, Tania.

2010 Urban Māori. *In* weeping Waters; The Treaty of Waitangi and Constitutional Change. Malcolm Mulholland and Veronica Tawhai, eds. Pp. 187-206. Wellington: Huia.

Raroa, Dennise.

N.D. Rakaipaaka Whakapapa. Personal Collection.

Reihana, Pikihuia.

2014 'Ngāti Pukamata': Virtual iwi: Using Facebook to manage whakapapa. Masters Thesis, Victoria University of Wellington.

Reilly, Michael P. J.

2004 Te tīmatanga mai o ngā atua. *In* Ki Te Whaiao: An Introduction to Māori Culture and Society. Tānia Ka'ai, John Moorfield, Michael P. J. Reilly and Sharon Mosley, eds. Pp. 1-12. Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand.

Roberts, Jude.

2006 Layer upon Layer; Whakapapa. Cambridge, New Zealand: Wotz Wot Ltd.

Sheehan, Jacob.

2013 The Koru Meaning – New Life and Harmony.
<http://www.mountainjade.co.nz/blog/thekoru-meaning-new-life-harmony/>, February 4, 2015.

Sissons, Jeff.

2004 Māori Tribalism and Post-settler Nationhood in New Zealand. *Oceania* 75 (1):19-31.

2013. Re-territorializing Kinship; For a Deleuzian Archaeology of Māori Hapuu. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.

Smith, Graham Hingangaroa.

1997 The development of Kaupapa Māori: theory and praxis. PhD Thesis. Auckland: The University of Auckland.

Smith, Graham Hingangaroa, Te Kawehau Hoskins and Alison Jones.

2012 Interview: Kaupapa Māori: the dangers of domestication. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies 47(2):10-20.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai.

1999 Decolonizing Methodologies; Research and Indigenous Peoples. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

2000 Māori Research Development - Kaupapa Māori Principles and Practices: A Literature Review. New Zealand: The International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education, University Of Auckland.

Statistics NZ.

2013 Iwi Profiles: Ngāti Rakaipaaka. New Zealand: Statistics NZ.

Te Awēkotuku, Ngahuia.

1991 He Tikanga Whakaaro; Research Ethics in the Māori Community – A Discussion Paper. Wellington: Manatu Māori.

Te Puni Kōkiri.

2007 Ngā Kaihanga Hou; For Māori Future Makers. New Zealand: Te Puni Kōkiri.

The Ngāti Rakaipaaka Story (Author Unknown).

2014 Te Tira Whakaemi o Te Wairoa Treaty Claims Truth and Reconciliation Event – The Ngāti Rakaipaaka Story.

Te Tira Whakaemi o Te Wairoa and The Crown.

2012 Terms of Negotiation. Version 3.3.

<http://nz01.terabyte.co.nz/ots/DocumentLibrary%5CTeTiraWhakaemiTermsofNegotiation.pdf>

June 1, 2014.

Vakalahi, Halaevalu F. Ofahengaue and Julia T. T. Taiapa.

2013 Getting Grounded on Māori Research. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 34(4): 399-409.

Waitangi Tribunal.

2011 *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei* (Vol. 1) (WAI262). Wellington: Legislation direct.

Warbrick, Paerau.

2012 'O ratou wenua': Land and Estate Settlements. *In* *Treaty of Waitangi Settlements*. Nicola R. Wheen and Janine Hayward, eds. Pp. 92-101. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited.

Whaanga, Mere.

2004 *A Carved Cloak for Tahu*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.

Wheen, Nicola R. and Janine Hayward, eds.

2012 The Meaning of Treaty Settlements and the Evolution of the Treaty Settlement Process. *In* *Treaty of Waitangi Settlements*. Pp. 13-25. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited.

Williams, Herbert W.

1971 *Dictionary of the Māori Language*. 7th ed. Wellington: GP Publications.

Williams, Jim.

2004 Papa-tūā-nuku; Attitudes to land. *Ki Te Whaiao: An Introduction to Māori Culture and Society*. Tānia Ka'ai, John. Moorfield, Michael P. J. Reilly and Sharon Mosley, eds. Pp. 50-60. Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand.

Wilson, Shawn.

2008 *Research Is Ceremony; Indigenous Research Methods*. Canada: Fernwood Publishing.

Interviews

Avon Raroa, 2014. Interview, July. Nuhaka.

Esta Wainohu, 2014. Interview, July. Nuhaka.

Graeme Symes, 2014. Interview, July. Nuhaka.

Hana Whaanga, 2014. Interview, July. Nuhaka.

Hickson Raroa, 2014. Interview, July. Nuhaka.

Irene Wesche, 2014. Interview, July. Nuhaka.

John Whaanga, 2014. Interview, September. Wellington.

Koroniria, 2014. Interview, December. Hamilton.

Liz Hunkin, 2014. Interview, July. Nuhaka.

Tāmati Olsen, 2014. Interview, August. Wellington.

Appendix A - Map

Accessible online at http://www.tkm.govt.nz/rohe/ngati_rakaipaaka.jpg

---

Appendix B – Glossary

Māori to English translations are listed here for Māori words that are used more than once. If they are used only once their translation is in the corresponding footnote.

Ahi	<i>Fire</i>
Ahi kā	<i>Burning fires of occupation</i>
Aroha	<i>Love</i>
Atua	<i>Gods</i>
Haka	<i>Māori dance</i>
Hapū	<i>Kinship group made up of whānau – see Chapter 3</i>
Hōhā	<i>Annoyed, fed up</i>
Iwi	<i>Kinship group made up of hapū - see Chapter 3</i>
Iwi ahi kā	<i>Those living within their tribal territory</i>
Iwitanga	<i>Iwi identity</i>
Iwi taura here	<i>Those residing outside of their tribal territory</i>
Kanohi ki te kanohi	<i>Face to face</i>
Kaumātua	<i>Adult, elder</i>
Kaupapa	<i>Topic</i>
Kaupapa Māori	<i>Māori approach – see Chapter 2</i>
Kōhanga	<i>Language learning nest</i>
Koru	<i>A spiral shape regularly used in Māori art based on the shape of an unfurling fern frond – See Chapter 3</i>
Kōrero	<i>Narrative, story, conversation, to converse</i>
Kupu	<i>Words</i>

Mahi	<i>Work</i>
Mana	<i>Prestige, authority, control, power</i>
Mana Whenua	<i>Power associated with possession and occupation of tribal land - see Chapter 4</i>
Manaakitanga	<i>Hospitality, kindness, generosity, support – see Chapter 2</i>
Māoritanga	<i>Māori identity</i>
Marae	<i>Courtyard - the open area in front of the whareniui. Often used in this thesis to include the buildings around the marae</i>
Maunga	<i>Mountain</i>
Mokopuna	<i>Grandchild/grandchildren</i>
Ngā Taonga Anamata	<i>Cultural capital for the future</i>
Ngā whare rau o Te Tahinga	<i>The hundred houses of Te Tahinga – see Chapter 1</i>
Pā	<i>Fortified village</i>
Pākehā	<i>New Zealander of European descent, often used in this thesis as a synonym for Western or European origin</i>
Pēpeha	<i>See Chapter 4</i>
Poi	<i>A light ball on a string of varying length which is swung or twirled rhythmically to sung accompaniment</i>
Pūtea	<i>Sum of money</i>
Rakaipaakatanga	<i>Rakaipaaka identity – see Chapter 4</i>
Rangatahi	<i>Younger generation, youth</i>
Rangatira	<i>Person of high rank</i>
Rohe	<i>Tribal territory</i>
Tangata whenua	<i>Indigenous peoples of Aotearoa, i.e. Māori</i>
Taniwha	<i>Powerful water spirit/creature</i>
Taonga	<i>Treasure, resource</i>

Te ao Māori	<i>The Māori world</i>
Te re Pākehā	<i>English language</i>
Tino Rangatiratanga	<i>Self-determination</i>
Tipuna/Tipuna	<i>Ancestor/Ancestors</i>
Tohunga	<i>Skilled person, Expert, i.e. tohunga whakapapa – whakapapa expert</i>
Tūrangawaewae	<i>A place where one has rights of residence and belonging through kinship and whakapapa</i>
Waiata	<i>Song. Waiata tangi – mourning song</i>
Wairua	<i>Spirit</i>
Wānanga	<i>Seminar, conference</i>
Whakapapa	<i>Genealogy – see Chapter 4</i>
Whakataukī	<i>Proverb, saying</i>
Whānau	<i>Blood kin, extended family</i>
Whanaunga	<i>Relative, blood kin</i>
Whanaungatanga	<i>Relationship, kinship, sense of family connection</i>
Whenua	<i>Land</i>